

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 907, Vol. 35.

March 15, 1873.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE RESIGNATION OF THE MINISTRY.

THE tone of Mr. GLADSTONE's speech on Tuesday night foreshadowed the result of the division. He spoke with unusual force, and never better maintained the dignity of his position, but he spoke like a man who knows that the battle he is fighting is lost, and that he has only to fold his robe round him and die honourably. Mr. DISRAELI had done his utmost to make the division a strictly party one, and to win a victory, and, according to the rules of political warfare, he was not to be blamed for doing so. The Irish Catholic vote was irretrievably lost to the Ministry after Mr. CARDWELL's speech, if not before, and the Government had made every possible concession in order to remove the objections of those who thought that the Bill was too favourable to the priests. If the Bill had been introduced in the shape into which it was virtually moulded by the Government before the division took place, the ground taken both by the Conservatives and by nine-tenths of the English Liberals who voted against the Government would have been cut away from them. The real question, therefore, was whether the concessions of the Government would disarm the Opposition; and Mr. DISRAELI was forced to stake the issue upon a purely party question. He bade his supporters not to accept the concessions of the Government, because they could not trust the Government. The Government pretended to concede now in order to withdraw their concessions afterwards. A Liberal Ministry was not to be trusted by Conservatives. With regard to Ireland, as the Bill had no longer any life in it, both leaders naturally had something to say which might guide the future action and perhaps determine the future destinies of their party. Both agreed that the disestablishment of the Irish Church was the real bar to any plan of concurrent endowment. Mr. DISRAELI said that the Liberals, by adopting a totally wrong principle, and taking away from the Protestants that which they had, interposed a fatal obstacle in the way of the statesmanlike policy of giving the Catholics that which they asked for. The Romish hierarchy have really, in Mr. DISRAELI's opinion, defeated themselves by sacrificing the Irish Church. Mr. GLADSTONE, on the other hand, said that the Liberals, by adopting the right principle that money over which Parliament has control in Ireland shall not be at the disposal of one sect more than of another, had of course determined beforehand a case so manifestly coming within this principle as the proposal to endow a Catholic College or University. Perhaps he thought it necessary to remind amiable people like Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE, who show that they would like to give the Catholics a little money if they make so much fuss about it, that to do this would be to violate the principles on which their favourite Bill for Disestablishing the Irish Church was founded. It is absurd to talk of any coalition or understanding between the Ultramontanes and the Conservatives; but while Mr. GLADSTONE says that to give what the Ultramontanes declare is the only thing they will take would be to violate his principles and those of his party, Mr. DISRAELI says that to give this would be to violate the principles which not the Conservatives, but the Ultramontanes themselves, and Mr. DISRAELI's adversaries, in dealing with the Irish Church, have successfully established.

The consequence of the adverse vote of the House of Commons has been, in accordance with general expectation, the resignation of the Ministry. The conduct of the Ministry at the several steps which have led up to this result has been severely criticized, but principally perhaps from a failure to look at the matter from the point of view natural to a Ministry. In the first place, it is said that Mr. GLADSTONE ought never to have made the success of this Bill a vital question for the Ministry. He ought to

have suggested a Bill and have seen whether Parliament was inclined to pass it. No weight ought to be attached to this argument. The real fault of the Government was in keeping their scheme so dark that they lost all the benefit of criticism on it beforehand; but when they had determined on its main outlines, they would have been doing justice neither to themselves nor to their Bill unless they had declared that they would use the whole force of the Government to carry it. They were doing, as they considered, a work of justice, and they knew that to do it successfully was difficult. Unless they had shown themselves thoroughly in earnest, the Bill could have had no chance whatever. Their next duty was to decide whether, after the strong disapproval which the Bill excited from so many various quarters, they should withdraw it; and here there was much to be said on both sides, for there was something absurd in persevering with a measure intended to conciliate Irish members after every Irish party had pronounced against it. But then it is only fair to recollect that a Ministry, when it has once coupled its fate with the fate of a particular measure, has great difficulty in severing the tie and deciding to live on while the Bill dies. It thenceforth loses the power of persuading men that it is in earnest, and inspires a fatal doubt whether it is not clinging to place without power. Having decided to abide by the vote of the House, the Ministry had to determine whether it would resign or dissolve, and on this point the decision of the Ministry was uncontestedly right. A Prime Minister has no business to dissolve on a question which he has made a vital one unless he honestly thinks that the constituencies will reverse the decision of the House. Now no one could pretend to believe that a new House of Commons would be elected more likely to pass an Irish University Bill acceptable to Mr. GLADSTONE than the present House, and Mr. GLADSTONE had also to think of the interests of the large body of his faithful supporters. He could not have done them a greater injury than to have sent them to their constituencies on such an occasion, when they must have either associated themselves with the mistakes and ill-fortune of their leaders, or have most seriously weakened the party organization by separating themselves from their leaders, and appealing to the general pity and gratitude of Liberal electors, and asking them to overlook a single error which the candidate deplored as much as any one else.

The Ministry having resigned, the question of the moment is whether Mr. DISRAELI will consent to take office. The Conservatives have a perfectly clear field before them. There is no analogy whatever between the position which they would occupy now and that which they occupied in 1867 and 1868. They were then a minority engaged in carrying through a great measure in the face of their opponents, and they had to suffer the innumerable humiliations which must attend such an attempt. Now they would be in office merely engaged in carrying through the necessary formal business prior to a dissolution. If Mr. HARDY or any one else gave Mr. BENTINCK the assurance which determined his wavering vote, that the Conservatives would not take office during the continuance of the present Parliament, there would be no violation of such a pledge in taking office merely to wind up the affairs of the present Parliament and to call a new one. The objection of independent Conservatives—and it is an objection fully shared by the Conservative leaders in the Lords—is to any attempt to govern with a minority, and to sit with the lash of triumphant opponents always hanging over them. This objection does not at all apply under the present circumstances. If the Session must still last some time longer, it will last, not for the convenience of the Conservatives, but for that of the nation. The sooner an election can take place the better for everybody; but it is a

satire on Parliamentary institutions to argue that Mr. DISRAELI cannot properly come in because the division giving him the option of accepting office was taken a week too late in March. Possibly a new Parliament could not be got together before late in May, and possibly, if this is the case, it would be better to finish off the whole Parliamentary work of the year, and postpone the election till July. But this is a consideration which ought to have nothing to do with the course taken by the Conservatives. Their position would be simply that of men holding office with the intention of dissolving at the earliest moment convenient to the country, and any reflections on them as on men holding office under the humiliating condition of being in a minority in the House of Commons would be entirely unjust. The one point they have to consider is whether, when they do dissolve, they can hope to get a majority in the House of Commons, or, at any rate, not to have a majority against them. What are the prospects of the next election? is what they have to ask. Probably their own agents could not tell them very exactly, and we know how entirely the Conservative agents miscalculated at the time of the last election, when they inspired Mr. DISRAELI with a belief that he would have a large majority after the dissolution. But the general opinion of competent judges of all parties is not likely to be very far wrong, and this opinion concurs in anticipating that the Conservatives would lose few seats and gain many. Even now, if the Irish Catholic Liberals are deducted, the present Government has only a very slight majority, and it is a tolerably safe guess to say that at any rate this slight majority will at the next election be transferred to their opponents. If the Irish Catholic Liberals, many of whom, if they reappear at Westminster, will probably return not only as the nominees of the priests, but as the advocates of Home Rule, are put down as supporters of Mr. GLADSTONE, then perhaps the Conservatives would be in a minority in the next Parliament. But Mr. GLADSTONE would be very reluctant to come into office with a minority apart from the Irish vote, and, if so, the Conservatives might hold office in reliance, not on the forbearance, but on the fears of their opponents. They would not have a very pleasant time of it with an even balance of parties; but then no party could, under the circumstances, have a very pleasant time of it; and with prudence and care there is no apparent reason why they might not hold office for a respectable length of time, without any loss of credit and self-respect. There would, however, be much inevitable anxiety and uncertainty involved in the acceptance of office under present circumstances, and it would not be a matter of surprise if Mr. DISRAELI and his friends should shrink from the risk, although even then it is by no means certain that the Ministerial crisis would be at an end, and that it would be so easy to get Mr. GLADSTONE to resume office as some of those who dread a dissolution expect.

THE CHANCELLOR'S DEFENCE OF HIS BILL.

THE tone of the debate in the House of Lords on the second reading of the Judicature Bill will afford genuine gratification to sincere law reformers, in spite of the forebodings with which its conclusion must fill them. The satisfaction so warmly expressed at the reappearance in public of the late LORD CHANCELLOR will command universal sympathy. Not law reformers only, but all who reverence high-minded intelligence, must rejoice once more to recognize in Lord HATHERLEY's speech the pure and clear ring of a noble mind, as free from jealousy as it is replete with power. There was much too that was reassuring in the whole debate, and especially in the reply of the LORD CHANCELLOR. With that generous consideration towards fair opposition which has been not an ornament only but a tower of strength to him throughout his brilliant career, Lord SELBORNE frankly and candidly discussed the objections which we had raised to the frame of his Bill; and though he has not succeeded in dissipating our alarm at his measure, he has restored the confidence which we, in common with the whole world alike of lawyers and laymen, reposed in his conception of the great subject which he has taken in hand. His ideal of the reform needed, so far as we can see, differs in no essential respect from ours, and the same may be said of the views of every peer who took part in the discussion. Every principle for which we contended was admitted as fully as we could desire; and the only answers suggested to our remonstrance were that a complete reform would be impossible, that the Bill (at any rate after modification in Committee) would be found to be as large a stride as it was practicable to take, and that its defects were

merely transitional, and would lead to no permanent evils. We cannot persuade ourselves that any modifications short of an entire recasting of the Bill can really eradicate its faults. As it stands, its defects seem to us essentially of a permanent and not of a transitional character, and in our judgment the evil to be apprehended—the deterioration of Equity jurisprudence—far more than outweighs the mere gain in convenience and symmetry of procedure which it is the object of the Bill to secure.

Before considering in detail the LORD CHANCELLOR's explanations, we owe it to ourselves to notice one point on which our objections seem to have been misapprehended. We said that the general scheme of preserving under new names the existing divisions of the Courts would keep things in their old grooves, and make the reform more nominal than real. We further said that the one exception grafted on this rule, by which the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery was to be narrowed and its supremacy abolished, aggravated the mischief by destroying the machinery which has hitherto preserved the purity of Equity jurisprudence, without substituting the better machinery which a complete system of Courts all *docta utriusque juris* would supply. The LORD CHANCELLOR treated these as antagonistic objections, as if we had insisted, first, that all special grooves should be obliterated; and, secondly, that the groove in which the Court of Chancery is worked should nevertheless be permanently maintained. We desire nothing of the kind. We are anxious above all things that all such sectional divisions should be abolished and each Court made perfect in itself; but until this work of construction is completed—and the Bill does not even lay its foundation—we do desire that Equity should be preserved, even though it be by the clumsy contrivance of the old Writ of Injunction wielded by the old Court of Chancery. Once construct Courts to which the doctrines of Equity may be safely entrusted, and you may destroy the Court of Chancery without a word of remonstrance from us. But our complaint of this Bill is that it destroys and does not construct; that it abolishes the old safeguards—rude no doubt, but still efficient—without substituting any other safeguards to protect the highest portion of our law from gradual but certain deterioration. Granting, as we do grant, that our existing jurisprudence ought henceforth to rest on newer and more symmetrical foundations, would it not be folly to knock out the keystone of the old arch before you have built the new one? Would it not be madness to pull down the scaffolding before the permanent wall is raised? The Court of Chancery is the scaffolding on which Equity jurisprudence has rested until now—the Writ of Injunction is the keystone of the arch. Let these go by all means when you have founded a new structure, but in the meantime preserve them, lest your so-called fusion and reconstruction prove nothing but confusion and demolition.

But to return to Lord SELBORNE's reply to our warnings. What we understand him to say is in substance this:—"I do not question the soundness of your theories as theories; "my Bill is not so antagonistic to them as it seems; I am "even willing, as far as practicable, to mould its provisions "more into harmony with the principles on which you insist; "but I have found it impossible to do all that I could wish, "and I think it dangerous to push on too rapidly to the goal "without passing through the intermediate stage of transition "enforced by the necessities and circumstances of the case." No one who is not a mad enthusiast will deny the cogency of this kind of reasoning in any case to which it is fairly applicable. In politics we must often content ourselves with a short step in the right direction, however clearly we may see that a great stride would be incomparably better. But when such a plea is urged, it is of vital importance to be sure that the proposed step is unmistakably in the right direction, that the admitted defects are really transitional and not permanent, and that the impossibility of a more vigorous effort is clearly proved. On all these points Lord SELBORNE's speech, though full of masterly ingenuity, failed altogether to justify his Bill.

In the first place, let us ask what are the "necessities and circumstances" which call for the mutilation of any ideal scheme of reform? They all resolve themselves, directly or indirectly, into the single fact that the Common Law Bench enjoys an enormous numerical preponderance over the Equity Bench, with perhaps a corresponding preponderance of social and political influence. There is no other difficulty in the case. Strangely enough, this disparity does not exist because business of greater extent and importance finds its way to the older tribunals, but because—thanks to ancient habits and modern parsimony—suitors in Chancery are allowed but one judge to do the work which in the Common Law Courts is allotted to three or four. Much evil has resulted from this deficiency

of judicial strength. It has rendered the free resort to *vivid* evidence impossible, it has sapped the system of judicial administration in Chambers, and it has multiplied appeals by depriving the decisions of Courts of first instance of the weight that would attach to the judgments of full-manned tribunals. And now that reconstruction is the aim of every Chancellor, this same numerical weakness of the Equity Bench is the one serious obstacle to any real fusion, which can only be effected by bringing together Equity Judges and Common Law Judges on equal terms in every division of the contemplated Court. No one can say that a difficulty such as this is one that it surpasses the power of a Government to deal with. But, instead of grappling with it, Lord SELBORNE's Bill proposes to establish the predominance of Equity principles by perpetuating and aggravating the predominance of the Common Law Bench. Lord HATHERLEY indeed suggested that the difficulty might be gradually mitigated by appointing Equity Judges to seats in the Common Law division, and Common Law Judges to seats in the Equity division, and congratulated himself that he had so far acted on this principle as to select a distinguished Common lawyer for the Appellate Bench of the Court of Chancery. There are two objections to this proposal—one, that Equity traditions would have perished long before the process was complete; the other that no Government would have the courage to carry it into effect. Lord HATHERLEY himself, though he wisely (even at the cost of aggravating the existing disproportion of judges) selected Lord Justice MELLISH as the colleague of Lord Justice JAMES, never once during his tenure of office ventured to place an Equity lawyer on the Common Law Bench. Such an anomaly has not been heard of since Mr. ROLFE became a Baron of the Exchequer, when most of us were unborn; and Lord SELBORNE, we observe, has been too prudent to give either by word or deed the slightest encouragement to this chimerical idea. The same "necessities and circumstances" which have forbidden the introduction of a perfect Bill would equally forbid the process by which Lord HATHERLEY hopes that its shortcomings may hereafter be made good.

The arrangement proposed by the Bill, that the High Court shall be composed of seventeen Common Law and four Equity Judges, must therefore be regarded as permanent at least for one or two generations. Surely we are right in saying that this is not a defect for which Lord SELBORNE's plea of transitional difficulties can possibly be accepted. Under such conditions it is as idle to hope to infuse Equity principles into all our tribunals as it would be to entrust Liberal measures to a Coalition Cabinet in which Tories should preponderate in the proportion of four to one. While the materials to work with are so adjusted, no manipulation, however ingenious, can possibly supply the requisite power of the requisite kind for the determination of all the cases that will come before the Courts. Putting aside writs issued merely as means of compelling payment by debtors in arrear, the number of actions in which any questions of Law are involved will, we believe, be found to be less than the number of suits and matters in Equity; but, whether this be so or not, the aggregate amount of property dealt with, and the magnitude and intricacy of the rights involved, in the Equity suits of any given period, must largely surpass what would be met with during the like period in all our Courts of Common Law. If the High Court were constituted as proposed, more than half of its genuine judicial business must be expected to turn upon equitable doctrines. If this is even a remote approximation to the truth, how is the work to be done under the CHANCELLOR's Bill, except by the means which we have—not untruly, we think—described as a transfer of the administration of Equity from those who have studied it to those who have not? This is the fatal blot on the measure which no amendments in Committee can obliterate. It is in vain to argue, as Lord SELBORNE did, that his Bill authorises the occasional removal of judges and the transfer of causes from one division to another. For years, powers have existed under which Common Law Judges may be lent by one Court to another, and even supplied as assessors to the Court of Chancery; but the instances in which these powers have been exercised may be counted on the fingers of one hand. And this for a very good reason, which will not lose its force under the new *régime*. Judges and Vice-Chancellors are hard-worked men, and their ordinary duties are too exacting to allow of the disturbance which frequent migrations for special service would necessarily occasion. And another reason still more cogent would be added by the Bill. Every time that a Vice-Chancellor was sent to a Common Law division, his judicial power would be reduced

in the ratio of three or four to one, as he would then become a fraction only of a Court, instead of a complete tribunal. Moreover Equity Judges would be called for almost daily, while their scanty numbers would barely suffice for their own department. Nor would the difficulty be much mitigated by any frequent transfer of causes, for the Bill provides no workable machinery for the purpose; and, if it did, the result would be almost the same as that which is now effected by injunctions in Equity. In nine cases out of ten where actions are restrained the order is made before anything has been done beyond serving a writ, and occasionally filing a declaration. In all these instances the process is substantially one of transfer only, and the sole change which the Bill would introduce, if a really effective system of transfer formed part of its provisions, would be to leave the propriety of the transfer to be determined, not by the Court to which the cause is supposed to be appropriate, but by that which is asked to part with it on the ground of its own unfitness. Surely this would not be an improvement. There would be the old bandying, as it is called, from one tribunal to another, and a less mature discretion applied to the process.

We have considered the arguments of Lord SELBORNE with the strongest desire to be convinced; but we can see nothing in them which even palliates the vice of the Bill, nothing which promises to save Equity jurisprudence from destruction, nothing to encourage the hope that the mischief once established will be mitigated as time goes on, nor even anything to justify the exaggerated timidity which has induced our ablest law reformer to sacrifice his own ideal to imaginary necessities, and to circumstances which he had ample strength to control.

THE IRISH UNIVERSITY BILL AND THE IRISH VOTE.

THE noble indignation of the Catholic people of Ireland, taking effect through the votes of their representatives, has extinguished the Irish University Bill. This is the version of the division of Wednesday morning which for some time to come will be current on the other side of St. George's Channel. It may be doubted, however, whether this noble indignation will bear the ordeal of close inspection. As the Bill was first presented to Parliament it was an honest attempt to remove the disabilities of the Irish Roman Catholic laity in the matter of University Education. Their case at present is this:—If they wish their sons to enjoy the advantages of University training, they must send them to Trinity College, the traditions and successes of which are entirely Protestant. If they wish their sons to obtain a University degree, they must send them either to Trinity College or to the Queen's Colleges, of which last the traditions and successes, so far as there are any, are entirely secular. Had the Bill passed, even with all the modifications to which the Government had consented under the pressure of their English supporters, this grievance would have been entirely got rid of. Irish Roman Catholics might have obtained University training for their sons by sending them to a College in which the instruction and discipline would have been under the exclusive control of teachers of their own faith. They might have obtained a University degree for them on even easier terms, for the unattached student was placed under no restrictions as to his place of residence. By either of these channels Irish Catholic youths might have gained their full share of the honours and endowments of the University. In neither of them would their religious belief have been exposed to any danger, unless the mere neighbourhood of Protestant students in an examination, or the obligation to answer questions set perhaps by a Protestant examiner, can be considered to involve theological contamination. The grievance and the remedy were coextensive. The Roman Catholics complain that the Protestants of Ireland enjoy a monopoly of University education, and refuse to admit them to a share of it except upon terms which their consciences will not allow them to accept. The Bill took the matter out of the hands of the Protestants, and gave the Catholics access to degrees, honours, and emoluments, on the sole condition of passing the prescribed examinations. By so doing it did in effect give them access to College life. Students living and working together have many advantages over students living apart, and this fact would have been enough to fill the Catholic College in Dublin.

This, we repeat, is the grievance which Irish Roman Catholics have constantly complained of, and it is this grievance that the Bill proposed to redress. The Government were in no way obliged to bring the subject forward. They

might have secured the support of a majority of their own adherents, and the neutrality at all events of the Conservatives, if they had accepted Mr. FAWCETT's Bill. It was not a matter that pressed for settlement in the sense in which the Church Establishment and the relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland pressed for settlement. It was not a matter even upon which the Cabinet as a whole had any strong convictions. The origin of the Irish University Bill must be traced to Mr. GLADSTONE's own recognition that the Irish Catholics were not fairly treated as regards University education, and to his determination not to let the subject rest. Considering that all this was perfectly well known to every one, that the introduction of an Irish University Bill conceived in this spirit had all along been regarded by the extreme section of English Liberals as the point at which they might be forced to withdraw their confidence from the Government, and that the Bill when introduced had proved exceedingly distasteful to them, it might naturally have been expected that the Irish Catholic members and the Irish Catholic laity would give it a hearty support. Perhaps if it had been brought forward in the first Session of a Parliament instead of in the last, this expectation might have had some chance of being fulfilled. An Irish member's deference to his leaders is usually greatest when the prospect of having to meet his constituents is most remote. During the interval which separates him from the next election, it is always possible that something may happen to make him indifferent to dissolution. Unlike the steward in the parable, he is less and less careful about making friends with the mammon of unrighteousness in proportion as the time for giving an account of his stewardship draws nearer. Still the Irish Catholic members would not have voted against the Government if to do so had not been agreeable to their constituents. A better proof of the need of education in Ireland could not be desired than the action of the Irish Catholic laity upon this question. They had the game in their own hands. The Bill gave them all that they have for years complained of being denied—a Catholic College, and a University to the endowments of which Catholics would have full access, and in the government of which they would have their full share. The Bishops would never have moved against such a Bill as this if the laity had had sufficient independence and common sense to declare themselves satisfied with it. The Bishops have no reason to care for the diffusion of University education. They already possess the maximum of influence over their flocks, and any increase of learning in Ireland can at most only leave that influence what it is. But Irish Catholic parents have a solid interest in University education being placed within the reach of their sons upon conditions which shall not be hostile to their faith. They have let this interest go for nothing because the Bishops thought the occasion a good one for reviving a demand which they, as well as the rest of the world, knew could never be granted. If the Bishops had had anything to lose by this manœuvre, they would probably have thought twice before resorting to it; but as it was only their flocks who could lose by it, they were able to go into battle with a light-hearted indifference to consequences. When their flocks find out that the passing of Mr. FAWCETT's Bill is the sole result of a ten years' agitation, they will be in a position to appreciate the self-sacrificing devotion of their spiritual guides.

If the Irish members cared to defend a vote which they doubtless regard as the most natural thing in the world, they might say that, even if they had voted straight, the Bill would probably have been shipwrecked in Committee. Certainly no concessions which the Government could have made with honour would have altogether removed the objections of English Radicals. Mr. VERNON HARCOURT was thought to have spoken parables when he described it as a Bill to affirm, consolidate, and extend the system of mixed and united education in Ireland. In the proper sense of the words this description is perfectly true. It was a Bill to make it possible for Catholics to avail themselves of the system of mixed and united education in Ireland, and, considering that Roman Catholics form three-fourths of the population, a Bill which did this would have been pre-eminently a Bill to consolidate and extend that system. But to the mind of an English Radical mixed education ordinarily stands for something of which Catholics are certain not to avail themselves. His idea of a mixed University is not a University in which various religions maintain separate Colleges for their own students, but a University in which all the Colleges are open to students of all religions. In a country where religious belief is strong and definite this latter form of University must always fail to answer to its purpose. The only form

which will meet the case is the form that would have been created by the defeated Bill. Supposing that the Radicals had consented to the affiliation of the Catholic College, and that the Irish members had consented to the omission of the "gagging" clauses, there would still have remained the difficulty about the Council. In theory this need have been no difficulty at all. An academical Council ought to be elected by an academical constituency, and when once the new University had got into working order, either the Senate, or such members of it as were engaged in actual University work, would have been a very proper body for the purpose. But in this case there was no academical constituency ready to hand. Graduates of Trinity College and of the Queen's Colleges would have been forthcoming in sufficient abundance; but where would have been the graduates of the Catholic College? It would have been altogether impossible to commit the control of the new institution during the first and most critical years of its existence to a body in which the persons whose introduction into the University was the main object of the Bill had no representatives. If all parties had been sincerely anxious to settle the question on fair terms, this obstacle might have been got over. The Government might then have said, We wish to do as far as possible what would have been done by mere lapse of time if a Catholic College had been affiliated to the University of Dublin thirty years ago; in that case there would now have been a body of Catholic graduates equal in all respects to the existing body of Protestant graduates; our object will be to place upon the Council the sort of members whom these Catholic graduates, in combination with the Protestant graduates, would have been likely to place on it of their own free choice. This would have been the only course the Government could have taken consistently with fairness to the Catholic element in the University. But it is far from certain that the existing House of Commons would have assented to their taking it. In a critical division in Committee the Conservatives would have voted against them, and the adhesion of the Irish Catholics might have been more than balanced by a secession of English Radicals. If political consistency is only admirable when it is certain to win immediate reward, the vote of the Irish members is excusable. Should they be disposed to quarrel with this estimate of their conduct, they will do well to remember that where excuses are concerned beggars cannot be choosers.

SPAIN.

THE suspended diplomatic action of the European Governments during the crisis of the Spanish Revolution is fully justified. If a Republic is hereafter definitively organized, with a reasonable prospect of continuance, it will probably be recognized by all the Powers, and certainly by England. It is reported indeed that some of the Continental Governments profess a disinclination to permit the establishment of a Federal Republic, probably because it would be associated with reminiscences of the Paris Commune; but the policy of England is settled and clear. Every nation has the exclusive right to determine its own form of government, and to deal through its chosen agents with foreign States. It is nothing to the English Government or people whether Spain may prefer a Monarchy, a despotism, a theocracy, or a centralized or Federal Republic. The only reason for delaying recognition is that nothing has hitherto been fixed, and that a communication addressed to a supposed Government might possibly be received by a hostile successor. The condition of the country is lamentable, almost hopeless, and strictly conformable with the anticipations which were formed by all sound politicians when the Republic was proclaimed. An accidental inversion of the order in which the telegraphic reports ought to have been received produced some confusion in the narrative of recent events; but it was not impossible to disentangle the accounts of what has occurred, and the gaps which divide different portions of the story have been since filled up in accordance with previous conjectures. A week ago the majority of the Assembly which is nominally recognized by the Executive Government as sovereign determined to assert its right to share in the determination of the national policy. The Progressists unanimously resolved to reject the Bill for the dissolution of the present Legislature, and for the convocation of a Constituent Cortes. Nothing in the way of argument or of novel occurrence has interfered with their persistence in their resolution; yet Señor CASTELAR is enabled to communicate to the Spanish Ministers in foreign countries, with his usual ornaments of rhetoric, that the Cortes have, after a patriotic speech by Señor RIVERO, passed the Bill

for the dissolution, and for the consequent election. The numbers of the division prove that the majority of the Assembly, instead of concurring with the proposal of the Government, abstained from voting; nor is their reason for withdrawing in any degree doubtful. As on the day when the Progressist members of the Cabinet were forced to resign, a mob of the patriots whom the Executive Government has supplied with arms surrounded the palace of the Cortes; and a truculent demagogue of the extreme Republican faction warned the majority, after the fashion of the Jacobin members of the French Convention, that, if they opposed the will of the people, the consequences would be terrible.

Another discussion which arose during the same sitting furnished a highly characteristic illustration of the spirit of the dominant party. Since the establishment of Señor CASTELAR's peaceable and orderly Republic, the shop-keepers and the other respectable inhabitants of Madrid have organized themselves in armed bodies for the defence of their lives and property against the bloodthirsty rabble. It must be admitted that the spontaneous formation of armed bodies is inconsistent with regular government; but the condition of Spain and Madrid is exceptional and revolutionary, and there is no doubt that the measures adopted by the tradesmen are exclusively defensive. The agitators in the Cortes fiercely denounced the efforts of the lamb to obtain protection against the wolf; and the Ministers scarcely ventured to affirm that associations for the safety of person and property were consistent with law. The Republicans taunted their opponents with derisive invitations to descend into the streets, where they might have probably become the victims of a massacre. It may be worth the while of extreme Liberals in countries not yet so far advanced as Spain to observe that the helpless victims of menace and of possible violence are even now called Radicals. Two or three years ago the Progressists or Radicals were busily engaged in demolishing all the safeguards which experience and foresight had provided against the unqualified domination of liberty, equality, and fraternity. The Constitution of which the unhappy Radicals were authors was at the time held up to the admiration of the professors of their faith in England. On the high authority of the ringleader of the Hyde Park riot, the enthusiasts who thought that the Rights of Man included the right of any man to his life and property are now rudely deceived by their more thorough-going rivals. The process by which Girondists invariably succumb to Jacobins will be repeated as often as ambitious charlatans attempt to govern, after destroying all the means of government. Perhaps the ignominious charge of Girondism may be found still more applicable to the promoters of the last revolution, who already find themselves compelled, against their will, to obey the mob of Madrid and the mutinous provincial deputations. There is no reason to suspect FIGUERAS or CASTELAR of willing complicity with the crimes which they find themselves perhaps unable to prevent.

It is stated that twenty-two provinces announced their intention of withdrawing their obedience from the Central Government if the Cortes had refused to vote for the convocation of a Constituent Assembly. Nearly all the rebellious provinces must have returned, by popular suffrage, members to the Cortes which they now set at defiance. It would be absurd to suspect that a Cortes which may be called constituent will be better able to command the allegiance of political malcontents. Since 1789 the Continental theory of revolutionary freedom has always implied unbounded license of disavowing the authority of any Government or Assembly which may interfere with the schemes of a faction. The future Cortes will be summoned, not to express the deliberate will of the community, but to furnish the Republicans with a kind of legal sanction. It is well known that in Spain as in France the actual Government can always control the elections; and FIGUERAS will have a Republican majority as SAGASTA and ZORRILLA have in turns within a single year respectively assembled a Conservative and a Radical Parliament. The present Ministers have provided themselves with a further security against any possible reaction. Though they profess to hold power under the Constitution of 1869, they have at their own discretion, and without the consent of the Cortes, summarily abrogated the constitutional limitation of the age of electors. According to the law, a voter must have attained twenty-five years; but the Ministers have coolly extended the franchise to every Spaniard over twenty. It is possible that there may be a difference of opinion as to the proper date of political majority; but, if there were such an offence as treason in revolutionary times, the Spanish Ministers would

incur some danger of impeachment. Arbitrary postponement of constitutional law to the convenience of a democratic faction will be universally approved by the Republicans, and perhaps but faintly censured by their opponents. After all, it matters little how a Cortes may be chosen which will be absolutely powerless when it has assembled. It is doubtful whether some of the most important Spanish provinces will allow members to be elected to a central Assembly. The provincial Deputation of Barcelona has assumed to itself supreme civil and military power; and, according to one report, Andalusia is about to set up for itself on a system of perfectly free trade with foreign countries. In the United States, where alone republican government is practically understood, it has been found necessary to give the central power exclusive control over duties on imports. There have been few odder proofs of the power of words than the predilection of the American people for any system, however unlike their own, which may call itself a Republic. No educated American can doubt that the Constitution of England is much nearer in practice than the newfangled Spanish Republic to that of the United States; yet the PRESIDENT in a State paper thinks it becoming to indulge in irrelevant rodomontade about the approaching universality of the Republic; and his Government hastened to recognize the new Republic in Spain, as if CASTELAR and his colleagues had reasserted a divine right which had been forgotten.

There is at present from one end of Spain to the other not a nucleus of order or of good government. It could scarcely have been supposed beforehand that the despised Monarchy was so absolutely indispensable to national and social existence. The sagacity and patriotism of PRIM in maintaining royalty even while he was unable to find a King are forcibly illustrated by the anarchy which follows the decapitation of the Government. Unfortunately PRIM had himself inflicted a fatal blow on the principle of monarchy when he aided in dethroning a Queen on the ground of her personal demerits. Kings and Queens may perhaps have no inalienable right to their thrones; but the nations which they represent have a right to the continuance of their hereditary institutions. King AMADEO was, through the effects of the previous Revolution, and also in his capacity of a foreigner, more unstably placed than Queen ISABELLA; but he also seems to have exercised a beneficial influence on the popular imagination as a recognized symbol of law, of order, and of national unity. In ancient Greece, in mediæval Italy, and in the United States, Republican institutions have occupied the place as objects of national loyalty which elsewhere belonged to the reigning sovereign; but in Spain, as in all places which have followed the precedents of the French Revolution, a Republic is understood to mean either the negation of government, or the prostitution of legal authority to the interests and passions of riotous mobs. It may be conjectured that honest and moderate Republicans would by this time give much for an opportunity of undoing their own hasty work, and restoring the institutions which they formerly denounced. It is doubtful whether the extreme revolutionists will suspend the execution of their schemes during the melancholy farce of the general election.

THE SOUTH WALES STRIKE.

EVEN if it were true that the South Wales strike is practically at an end, accurate local knowledge would be required to render perfectly intelligible the nature of the partial arrangement which has been effected. It has long been evident that the amount of wages formed a secondary consideration with the masters. During the continuance of the strike, and partly in consequence of its existence, the price of iron has risen still further; and in all the abortive negotiations of the last few weeks it has been assumed that the autumn rate of wages would without difficulty be restored at the beginning of April. The great object of the masters was to settle the dispute directly with their men, so that the interference of the Union and its agents might be formally repudiated. Mr. HALLIDAY and his colleagues have repeatedly asserted that the colliers struck of their own accord, and that the Union has only interfered in support of a contention which it regarded as just; but it is impossible to doubt that the colliers ascertained beforehand that they would be backed by the Union; and during the struggle the agents from a distance have repeatedly prevented the men from coming to an agreement with their employers. As the great majority of the whole working population had no connexion with the Union, it is not surprising that the

ironworkers at one place after another should have finally determined to resume work on terms which involved on their part only a slight or nominal concession. The reduced rate of wages is to be accepted for the remainder of the present month, when the ten per cent. abatement will be discontinued. The masters have on several occasions intimated their intention of behaving liberally to the men, and their assurances seem to command general confidence. At most of the works which were supposed to have been closed for want of fuel large stocks of coal appear to have been accumulated; and consequently they are able to resume business after a comparatively short delay. Unfortunately it appears that the colliers, who were the most formidable class of malcontents, still refuse as a body to return to their work without the consent of the Union agents; and, unless their place can be supplied, they will, as soon as the stocks of coal are exhausted, once more be able to interrupt the whole industry of the district. The Union will not fail to make great exertions to continue the contest until the demands which were originally preferred have been conceded. It is not impossible that at the end of March the strike may terminate without the conclusion of any formal treaty. The masters from the first fixed a term of three months for the payment of reduced wages; and they may accordingly return to the old rate at the expiration of the period without inconsistency. The colliers on their part can, if they think fit, profess to have succeeded in their object when they resume work at the old rate of wages. The main object of the Union leaders will be to satisfy the men that they have obtained a victory, as Mr. FISI still protests that he secured a decision on the Indirect Claims.

There is little use in arguing, like Mr. ROEBUCK, that combinations of labour against capitalists are morally wrong. The South Wales colliers and the Miners' Association will secure all the justification which they are likely to desire, if, even at the cost of a sacrifice on their own part, they ultimately force the masters to accede to their terms. The powers of either party are practically the measure of their respective rights, and to the present time the struggle, though it has lasted for many weeks, has not conclusively proved which of the contending bodies is the stronger. The colliers are, as compared with the whole industrial population of the district, few in number, and the great majority of them have a claim as members on the funds of the Union. The enormous wages which are at present received by the whole body of colliers and miners provide the means of maintaining the strike, perhaps for an indefinite time; and a large proportion of the men who refused to work in their own district are now earning money elsewhere, and are contributing to the support of their comrades. In a sermon or in an ethical disquisition a proof that the strike was morally culpable might be appropriate and perhaps convincing, but it is a waste of time to question the right of men to do what they will with that which is so peculiarly their own as their time and their labour. The misuse of any other kind of property may be checked by law, and in some extreme cases it is liable to be punished by confiscation; but compulsory labour, which is the only form in which the property of working-men could in any case be forcibly appropriated, is evidently out of the question. Nor is it more profitable to complain that in the natural course of events associated bodies of uneducated men are governed by leaders who may be plausibly denounced as agitators or demagogues. Abuse of Mr. HALLIDAY is as ineffective as abuse of Cardinal CULLEN and the Irish Bishops, who are also in the habit of organizing resistance to established authorities. As long as the obedience to a hierarchy or a Trade Union is voluntarily rendered, legal interference is ineffective, and indignant censure is wasted. As Mr. LOWE says, tempests and earthquakes must be endured, for the proverbial reason that they cannot be cured. No good result followed from either the legislation or the clamour which were provoked twenty years ago by the Papal aggression. The aggression of the Miners' Association and its delegates on the happy valleys of South Wales is an analogous and much more formidable dispensation. It is an unfortunate circumstance that the managers of the strike have so far a separate interest from their clients that they may be tempted to prolong the quarrel rather for the purpose of asserting the supremacy of the Union than in the hope of bettering the condition of the men.

The intelligent newspaper Correspondents who record the daily history of the strike, as of all other contemporary transactions, have thrown no light on the possibility of supplying the places of the malcontent colliers. Some of the colliers have returned to work; but the Unionists who form the great majority still hold out. It may be taken

for granted that those who are accustomed to mining operations of any other kind could on occasion apply their skill to the extraction of coal, and it was reported some time since that the closing of the Abersychan iron-field would disengage some thousands of miners, who would be enabled to obtain higher wages in the pits. As nothing has lately been said of the reopening of the coal-mines, while the ironworks are gradually resuming operations with the aid of fuel which had been previously accumulated, there seems reason to fear that the colliers on strike have found means of deterring competitors from occupying their vacant places. The influx of a new body of colliers into the pits would at once terminate the strike by rendering its successful prosecution hopeless; and if the theories of political economy were to work with ideal smoothness, labour would be immediately attracted to a highly profitable employment. The influence which trade organizations exercise, sometimes by intimidation, and sometimes by reliance on a rude sense of honour, practically obstructs the flow of labour from one occupation to another. It is impossible to suppose that Mr. HALLIDAY and the Council which he represents would be blind enough to maintain the strike if it were known that the masters were able to provide themselves from new quarters with the labour which they require. If nevertheless even an inadequate number of working colliers can be enlisted, the masters will assuredly not concede any portion of the demands of the men. Although they have been deserted by one of their number, the great ironmasters have hitherto displayed unbending resolution; and they would perhaps be content to keep their works closed for another year, in preference to admitting Mr. HALLIDAY and his fellows to a share in the regulation of industry which has hitherto been controlled by themselves. The partial reopening of the ironworks will at present prices enable them to recover a portion of the loss which they have sustained; and when their present stock of coal is exhausted, they will probably be prepared again to let their capital lie idle for a considerable time. It is hardly to be expected that they should tamely abandon their business as the alternative of humiliation and defeat.

The anomalous or novel demand that wages should bear a definite proportion to profits is founded on the assumption that the workmen possess a natural or artificial monopoly. In a perfectly open market wages are regulated not by the greater or less profits of trade, but by the proportion between the demand for labour and the supply. In prosperous times wages have generally risen because employers have required additional hands; but the claim for higher payment on account of increased profits to the same number of workmen has only been preferred in recent years. The masters in different trades have in many instances countenanced for their own immediate convenience a theory which, if it were consistently adopted, would create a kind of one-sided partnership between the capitalist and the workmen. The bargain can never be equal, because the labourer necessarily insists on a minimum which is indispensable to his subsistence, while he recognizes no upper limit to the possible increase of wages. Colliers and miners, and perhaps other classes of workmen, seem to consider that their claim to participation in profits is already recognized as the basis of negotiations on wages. The West Yorkshire colliers, who are now demanding an increase of twenty per cent. on the high rate of wages which they have hitherto received, complain that the masters, after raising wages on former occasions, have increased the price of coals in a higher proportion; and they add, with amusing simplicity, that they have no confidence that the same proceeding will not be adopted again. Their anticipations are perfectly reasonable, though it is difficult to understand why the colliers should object to a rise in prices. Nothing can be further from the mind of the model British workman than any concern for the interests of the consumer, whose sole duty and privilege is to provide a fund which capitalists and workmen are afterwards to divide in a scramble. The West Yorkshire colliers are perfectly willing that half the community should starve in consequence of the dearness of coal, but they resent the contrivance by which the masters seem to them to have taken for themselves more than their due share of the plunder. If profits were a fund belonging in certain proportions to masters and workmen, the colliers would have a right to demand an account of the distribution. It is not impossible that even on this assumption the masters might be able to justify their rise of prices. If the men in West Yorkshire resemble their class elsewhere, their increased wages probably caused a diminution of the supply of coal and a consequent increase of price. If without violation of law any class of workmen can extort from

employers a partnership in the profits of capital, the new method of distribution will become, like all existing relations, in a sense legitimate. The consequences to workmen as well as to employers of the establishment of co-operative industry are not easily to be foreseen, and it is certain that when any body of men has acquired a beneficial interest, it will take precautions against any external interference with its rights, or, in other words, against competition. The South Wales ironmasters are more or less consciously contending for the opposite system, which has hitherto prevailed without question in all departments of industry.

GERMANY.

THE EMPEROR finds at present the task of opening the German Parliament an easy and satisfactory one. He has only to talk of pleasant things past and pleasant things to come, for an affluence of money gilds every prospect. Everybody, he was able to tell his Parliament, loves him and the Empire, and is anxious to be on the best of terms with both. The meeting of the Sovereigns last autumn at Berlin gave an assurance of peace which he will do his best to foster, and he may reflect with comfort that his sayings as to peace and war are not like the dark sayings of other days at the Tuilleries, when every phrase and word was scanned to see whether it was not meant to convey the contrary of its apparent purport. The Germans wish for peace, having got all they want, and their Sovereign honestly shares the feeling of his subjects. France, which provides the money that throws this hue of brightness over the situation in Germany, is also considerate enough to give no cause for apprehension in other ways. The EMPEROR referred with pleasure to the opinion he expressed a year ago that things would go on in France as quietly as could be wished until the bargain with Germany was fulfilled. Things have indeed gone on in France precisely as Germany would have wished them to go on, and enough security has been preserved to make the huge loan necessary for the payment of the indemnity possible, and to render the interference and even the complaints of the army of occupation impossible. Fortunately the intense antipathy of the population of the occupied districts to the enemy has been mitigated or kept under control, and there have been no collisions between the conquerors and the conquered. The EMPEROR expressly said that he had grounds for hoping that it would be possible to arrange for the complete evacuation of France at a comparatively early date, and that the final arrangements for this purpose would shortly be made. Three milliards and a half have been paid, and the French Government will be able to pay another half-milliard in May. This will leave only one milliard more to be provided, and the French Government will, it is expected, be able to arrange for the payment of this half-milliard in the autumn of the present year. The obstacle they have to face is not the difficulty of getting the requisite money or the securities they have to offer, but the danger of a possible disturbance of the money market. When every farthing has been paid, but not before, Belfort, the last pledge to remain in the hands of the Germans, will be evacuated. For some reason which they have never cared to state plainly, the Germans have devoted much time and money to increasing the strength of Belfort, and when the French get it back again they will find their solitary Eastern fortress a much more formidable place than it was when the capitulation placed it in German occupation. The Germans seem never to have felt sure that they would get the whole of the enormous sum they asked as an indemnity, and it may have occurred to them that their possession of Belfort as a place of great strength was the best incentive the French could have to make them eager to pay, while it was so placed as to give the Germans, until the money was paid, a hold on France equivalent to that of holding a much larger district than that actually occupied.

But the roses of the German Empire are not quite without their thorns, and the especial thorn of the EMPEROR and his advisers is Ultramontanism. The battle between Church and State is really an Imperial question, but as the battle-ground is for the present Prussia, it was not necessary for the EMPEROR to refer to the struggle when addressing the Imperial Parliament. It is because the position of the Emperor of GERMANY is endangered that the King of PRUSSIA is willing, and Prince BISMARCK is determined, to alter the whole relation of the Prussian State to the Catholic Church. This is a very serious business, and it is being pursued in a very serious way. Prince BISMARCK took

charge in the Upper House of the Bill for altering the Constitution, and his exertions have been successful, the Bill having been passed by a majority of ten. The position of the Prussian PRIME MINISTER is not very well defined, and Count von Roon appears to have acquiesced with the utmost readiness in being superseded by his great colleague on this occasion. What the Peers seem to have wished to know was the real honest answer to one of those questions which it is hard to put in direct terms. Did the KING and Prince BISMARCK really mean that the Bill must be carried? Reports as to the KING's hesitation have been flying about the Court for a long time, grounded apparently, not on anything he has ever let fall, but on the probability that he would be more or less moved by the whispers of persons very near to him who have strenuously maintained that the Evangelical Church was being sacrificed by the Government measure quite as much as the Roman Catholic. Prince BISMARCK, again, recently changed his official position, and the change was freely attributed to adverse Conservative influence. If it was rumours and surmises of this kind that were likely to agitate the mind of the Upper House, Prince BISMARCK was perfectly ready to administer a tranquilizing remedy. The KING was, he pointed out, more interested than any one in the passing of the Bill, for the contest is really one between the Monarchy and the priesthood; and subsequently Count Roon was most explicit as to the KING's views. For himself, Prince BISMARCK could safely say that he had not been deposed from the Premiership by adverse Conservative influence, for he does not see that the Conservatives have any influence. Their party, as he frankly told the Peers, is broken up; their power gone. There is no place for their ideas in modern Prussia. Liberalism is the order of the day and carries all before it, simply because it feels that there is and can be no serious resistance offered to it. In England a Liberal Minister forcing a Liberal measure on a reluctant House of Lords would have proceeded in a much tamer and smoother way, and would have been as courteous and flattering as possible, and tried to make the Lords believe that they were after all doing what they liked to do, or at least were making a sacrifice in a virtuous and magnanimous way. But Prince BISMARCK either thinks that complete frankness is the most efficacious of all instruments for producing obedience, or else considers that the members of the Upper House are proof against pleasant phrases, and will yield to no argument except that of stern necessity.

Count von Roon acknowledged that he had received from the provinces many petitions requesting the withdrawal of the Bill, so that the Ministry has had to face more real opposition than would be indicated from the ease with which the Bill has passed the two Houses of Parliament. But he says that he and his colleagues and their Sovereign have been firm, because they look on the measure entirely as a political one, and one that for political reasons it is indispensable to pass. That the Bill is merely political and not adverse to any religious belief, and that the rupture with Rome has come from Rome and not from Germany, are the two main facts which the Prussian Ministry, and Prince BISMARCK above all, wish the public to get into its head. The clergy claim to disobey the laws and to oppose the Crown on the ground that they have to look to other laws and to obey another Sovereign. To make them, as Prussian subjects, obey the laws of Prussia, and to make them yield precedence to no Sovereign over their own Prussian KING, is the main object of the Bill. To put enough pressure on them for the attainment of this end it is necessary to alter the legal relations of the Church and the State; but whose fault is that? Prince BISMARCK told his hearers that when the French war was over the German Government was desirous to cultivate the most friendly relations with the Papacy. Italy, he candidly acknowledged, had not so behaved during the war as to deserve much favour at the hands of Germany, and the new Emperor of GERMANY was quite willing to be the good friend of the prisoner of the Vatican. But his offers were contumeliously rejected; the Papal Government decided to enter on the most bitter opposition to the new Empire, and to use its powerful machinery to break it up if possible. Struck by this unexpected blow, the Empire has struck back in return. The existing Constitution of Prussia was based on a compromise such as moderate men love and can work. But a new spirit has come over the Church of Rome, and it now abandons all compromise. It will take nothing less than all it chooses to ask for, and what it asks for is that the State shall be the slave of the Church. This is Prince BISMARCK's account of the rupture of Prussia with Rome, and whether the measures he is taking are wise or not, no one can doubt that his chief

assertion is quite true. If any proof were necessary to those who have been reading for the last week the debates on the Irish University Bill, they have only to look at the strange address lately presented to the Pope by a band of ardent Catholics belonging to the chief European countries. They tell him that his wicked enemies are always trying to lure him into some compromise, and tempting him to live quietly with his neighbours; but that such enemies are only formidable when an attempt is made to negotiate with them, and that the true method, that to which the present Pope has given his adhesion with so much noble frankness and perseverance, is to refuse them everything, to oppose them in every way, to call them openly "Sons of Satan," and treat them as such on every possible occasion. This sort of spirit does certainly destroy what Prince BISMARCK describes as the *modus vivendi*. Nor do the new opponents of the State by any means confine themselves to words. They claim and assert the liberty of doing anything they please. Not long ago the civil power in Prussia decreed that primary instruction in certain districts of East Prussia should be given in German. This might or might not have been expedient; but it was a merely political act. The Archbishop of POSEN, however, did not approve of the order, and positively told his clergy to disobey it, and give primary instruction in Polish in the schools to which the Government order applied. Prince BISMARCK was naturally not sorry to have such an instance to quote of what he meant when he said that the struggle was a political one, and lay between the KING and the priesthood. Compromise, which Prince BISMARCK till lately thought possible and desired, is impossible now, and he cannot conciliate those who will not be conciliated, nor refuse to fight those who attack him.

THE SOUTHERN STATES OF AMERICA.

THE Southern States of America have not yet begun to recover from the ruinous effects of the war. The promoters of Secession committed a fatal mistake when they commenced a contest in which, as the result has proved, they were destined to be beaten. On the other hand, the victorious party have been disappointed in their confident belief that they could restore the spirit as well as the outward form of the Union. The problem was difficult, if not wholly insoluble, and it may be admitted that the measures which have been adopted have for the most part been suggested by plausible reasons. After the close of the war the sore and angry feeling of the defeated community might probably have soon disappeared, if, in accordance with the policy of Mr. LINCOLN and Mr. ANDREW JOHNSON, the Southern citizens could have been remitted to the political condition which had been interrupted by the war; but it was impossible that Congress should neglect to recognize the fundamental change which had been effected by the emancipation of the slaves. It was the plain duty of the Federal Legislature to provide for the protection of the coloured population; and American institutions admit of no protective mechanism except that of perfect political equality and universal suffrage. Popular rhetoric only expressed and illustrated the general conviction that the right of voting constituted the single and sufficient security against the oppression to which the freedmen might have been exposed; and accordingly it was enacted, in an Amendment to the Constitution, that no inhabitant of the United States should be subject to political disability on account of his race or colour. The immediate object of the measure has for the present been attained, although negroes in some Southern districts have been exposed to outrages which would under any political system have been gross violations of law. Universal suffrage may sometimes afford protection to the lowest and weakest class of a community; but it unluckily confers a share in sovereign power as well as facility for self-defence. Negroes, like all other living creatures, are entitled to immunity from wrong; but the liberated slaves of the Southern States are utterly disqualified from taking a part in the government. The belief in democracy which has become a superstition in the United States was originally founded on the not unreasonable assumption that the average American citizen was fully qualified to vote for representatives and public functionaries. Like all abstract propositions, the theory that universal suffrage is just and expedient has a tendency to become independent of the conditions which rendered it approximately true. The vagaries of the Irish civic constituency of New York have produced only a local scepticism, which is moreover confined to municipal administration. Respectable tradesmen who think that city taxpayers should control the administration of city

taxes are still untroubled with a doubt of the right of every man to take part in Federal elections. With a blind faith in phrases, the Republican majority determined to extend the blessings of freedom and equality to three or four millions of negroes who were far below the level of the most backward and degraded inhabitants of any civilized country. It was true that there would have been great difficulty in devising an intermediate condition between absolute disability and full admission to political rights; but the experiment, although it may have been excusable, has thus far wholly failed. The newly enfranchised citizens have, as might have been expected, abused their privileges; and it is not impossible that they may suffer from a future reaction.

The utter ignorance and incapacity of the negro voters rendered it inevitable that they should become the tools of unscrupulous demagogues. In some places they have found leaders of their own race; but they have generally fallen into the hands of Northern adventurers who are known by the significant title of "carpet-baggers." In every State which is controlled by a coloured majority scandalous corruption prevails; and Governors, State legislators, and representatives in Congress exaggerate and parody the vices and follies to which popular government is liable. The respectable members of the community are excluded from power, and extravagantly taxed; nor can there be any doubt that they deeply resent the supremacy of an alien and inferior race. In Louisiana, and especially in New Orleans, the dominant faction is split into two hostile bodies, which from time to time elect antagonistic Governors and Assemblies, and which apparently dispose of rival armed forces. The Federal Government, which ought to exercise a moderating influence, habitually regulates its interference by considerations of party. General GRANT has invariably supported a faction which has been declared by a Republican majority in the Senate to have no legal right to represent the State. At the last election in Louisiana the candidates who obtained the majority of votes received certificates of election from unqualified officers, while the genuine functionaries gave a fraudulent certificate of election to the delegates of the minority. At present it would seem that there are no regularly constituted authorities in the State; nor is there any early prospect of a cessation of anarchy. In other Southern States elections of United States Senators have proved to be void; and some of the Governors have been guilty of enormous embezzlement. The great and ancient State of Virginia, notwithstanding the abundance of its natural resources, is unable to borrow money, because the Legislature and the Government command no confidence at home or abroad. The perverse iniquity of government by the greatest number of the whole population except in communities of an unusually high character, has never been so fully illustrated as in the reconstructed States of the South. As a recent and powerful writer remarks, multitudes can by no possibility really govern; and consequently the only question for constituent legislators relates to the method by which the actual rulers are to be selected. The facility of obtaining votes from an ignorant majority by intrigue or by the ordinary arts of a demagogue is the worst possible qualification for the exercise of political power. The principal motive for studying the contemporary history of other countries is the desire to ascertain the probable results of different political systems at home. There are happily no emancipated slaves in England, and all modern practice and opinion is utterly opposed to pecuniary corruption; but useful lessons may be derived from the practical reduction of a doctrine to absurdity in its application in an extreme case. It is by no means certain that the race of "carpet-baggers" might not be reproduced in England, if suitable constituencies were established as subjects for their speculations. A Parliament exclusively elected by artisans and labourers, though it might not sink to the level of Louisiana, would feel but little regard for the rights or interests of other classes.

It would be idle to blame the emancipated slaves for abusing powers which they were utterly incompetent to exercise or to appreciate; nor would they listen to a warning that they may perhaps forfeit the privileges which have been so ill employed. At present the negro majorities, though they are locally dominant, are in reality altogether dependent on their Republican patrons in the North. If the territory of the former Confederacy were independent, or if the Federal Government and Legislature were to abstain from interference in Southern affairs, the white population would at once resume their former supremacy. It is not improbable that they might take an undue advantage of their victory; but it is certain that they would find means of relieving themselves

from oppression and degradation. Their opportunity, although perhaps it may be distant, will ultimately arrive. It is scarcely possible that the misgovernment of the South should not produce a reaction of popular opinion in the United States, and sooner or later some political party will find it convenient to form an alliance with the white citizens of the South. For one or two generations the Democratic party governed the Union in combination with the Southern representatives; and although the South can never recover its original share of electoral power, its support might still incline the balance in favour of one of two rival parties. It is not likely that the Amendment which provides for the enfranchisement of the negroes will be at any time removed from the Constitution; but if the party in power had resolved on depriving the coloured race of political influence, American ingenuity would contrive methods of accomplishing the purpose. The facilities which an artificial and mischievous distribution of power has afforded for pecuniary corruption will, more than any other proof of Southern misrule, tend to create a desire for a change. The best class of Americans are shocked and alarmed by successive exposures of bribery and embezzlement. The City of New York has made a desperate and partially successful effort to shake off the obloquy which it had incurred; but the Legislature of the State is still suspected of corruption, and the chief perpetrator of the City frauds retains his seat in the local Senate. The discovery that bribes had been administered to Senators, Congressmen, and to some of the highest dignitaries of the Republic, has caused deeper indignation, because the culprits impudently denied the charges which have since been proved. The exposure of the swindling transactions of a former Republican candidate for the Presidency will strengthen the impression which has been produced by domestic frauds. It would be too much to expect that even the most candid Americans should at once allow that the foundations of their political faith are shaken. There is an honest struggle to believe that equality and universal suffrage have no relation to the actual results of an infallible Constitution. Before a painful scepticism affects the foundation of the Republic, it will probably find occupation in considering the condition of South Carolina, of Florida, and of Louisiana. The conviction that all white men are free and equal is compatible with a strong suspicion that negroes enjoy only a figurative equality, and that they are unfit for that kind of freedom which really means the exercise of political power. It is not improbable that public opinion will coincide with party interest in discouraging or suppressing the supremacy in any State of the coloured population. As the North will be still unanimously opposed to the re-establishment of slavery even in an indirect form, precautions will probably be taken against the abuse by the white population of restored political ascendancy. It is incredible that the anarchy of Louisiana or the misgovernment of South Carolina should be permanently tolerated.

FRANCE.

THE customary lull has followed the customary storm in the French Assembly. The several clauses of the Bill introduced by the Committee of Thirty have been hotly debated, but, except in the case of an amendment which was assented to by the Government, no change has been made in them. The Right have done their best to get the Assembly to pledge itself not to dissolve immediately upon the liberation of the territory. One amendment aimed at postponing until that time the discussion upon the Bills which the Committee have agreed that the Government shall bring in; another would have made the Assembly declare that it would not retire until it had exercised its constituent powers. Neither of these proposals had the approval of the Conservative majority. However anxious the deputies may be to keep their seats, most of them are too wise to assign any other date for a dissolution than the payment of the last instalment of the indemnity and the departure of the last German soldier. They have been able to stave off their fate hitherto because M. THIERS has no wish that it should overtake them sooner. Were they to go beyond this limit, they would exasperate the Republicans to a degree which might make it impossible for the PRESIDENT any longer to moderate between the factions which make up the Assembly. If M. THIERS were thus driven into a corner, there is little doubt which side he would choose. Even if the Assembly were more in favour with the country than there is any reason to suppose that it is, any sign of unwillingness to meet the electors when once the engagements it has entered

into with Germany have been fully performed would be enough to make it unpopular. The majority know this, and, what is even more to the purpose, they know that the PRESIDENT knows it. There was a time when they talked of the liberation of the territory and the provision of definitive institutions as coequal parts of the mission entrusted to them at Bordeaux. Now it is only the Extreme Right that pretends any longer to combine these duties. The moment of dissolution can as yet only be fixed by inference, but it can be fixed in that way with quite sufficient accuracy. The conduct of the negotiations with Germany may hasten or defer it in some degree, but it is universally understood that by 1874 the existing Assembly will have given place to its successor.

The question raised by the Report of the Committee of Thirty is how this interval shall be employed. The Committee were originally of opinion that it should be devoted to the construction of a machine for managing the elections, over the working of which M. THIERS should have no control. If the design had ever borne fruit, it would have been interesting to hear it defended by men who, when the PRESIDENT's right to take part in debates was under discussion, had stood up for the absolute separation of the legislative and executive authorities. Under pressure, partly of circumstances, and partly perhaps of late developed common sense, the Committee gave up this notion, and proposed, at the invitation of the Government, to pass the time that yet remains to the Assembly in constructing a Second Chamber, in revising the electoral law, and in providing for the continuance of the Executive during the elections. The Right and the Left have opposed these recommendations on opposite grounds. The Right urge with much truth that to legislate on these subjects is really to organize the Republic, and, in particular, that as the composition of a Second Chamber must be different according as it is to co-exist with a Republic or with a Monarchy, to construct it under a Provisional Republic is to beg the question unfairly. They are not unwilling to submit to the Republic if the Assembly will definitely proclaim it, but they do not wish to find themselves committed to it without the claims of Monarchy having been fairly entertained and disposed of. This way of putting the case has an exceedingly reasonable sound. It presents the majority in the ludicrous light of a body of men resigned to doing what they dislike because they have not courage to say what they would like to do. Yet, notwithstanding this, the majority which is acting so absurdly has more sense than its critics. The Right go on the assumption that the Assembly really speaks the mind of the country, and if this were true, nothing could be more contemptible than its present reticence. The Centres are well aware that it does not speak the mind of the country, and though it is not convenient to avow this fact, they wisely think that it is well to recognize it in their acts. If the Assembly had to decide between a Monarchy and a Republic, and if each member were to vote according to his real wish, a Monarchy would have a decisive and probably a large majority. But the only result of this step would be to make the want of sympathy between the Assembly and its constituents needlessly apparent. So long as M. THIERS is at the head of affairs, the country has a representative at Versailles who estimates and gives expression to its views with far more accuracy than the Assembly, and the majority feel that in some unforeseen way M. THIERS would take care that any decision they might come to in favour of a Monarchy should remain a barren exhibition of unsatisfied desire. The Left have also something to say for their opposition to the constructive part of the Committee's Report. Why, they ask, should France be saddled in this sudden fashion with a Second Chamber which it does not want? It is by no means easy to give a satisfactory answer to this question. The nearest approach to such an answer is that M. THIERS has insisted upon having a Second Chamber, and that when you have an indispensable man at the helm of the State, you have no choice but to carry what sail he orders. Why he is thus bent upon setting up in France a pale copy of the United States' Senate, with the Federal element which makes the strength of that Senate necessarily wanting, is not evident. It is conceivable that he should want to strengthen himself against the possible Radicalism of the next Assembly—though, if the electors will only take the trouble to vote, instead of allowing the most extreme candidates to be returned and then shrieking for protection against them, this necessity is not likely to arise. What is not so conceivable is how he intends to make a Second Chamber serve this purpose. In France, at all events, the Senate, or whatever else it has been called, has in times of revolution been a simple cipher. A Second Chamber is an imposing engine of defence, so long as there is nothing in par-

ticular to defend. When M. THIERS first disclosed his wishes on this subject, it seemed probable that he meant to use the newly elected Second Chamber as an auxiliary in getting rid of the First Chamber elected two years ago. But this idea, if it was ever entertained, has long been laid aside. Throughout the negotiation with the Committee of Thirty it has been conceded on both sides that the Second Chamber, though it is to be constituted at once on paper, is not to come into existence until after the dissolution. This would seem to show that M. THIERS really believes in a Second Chamber as an institution valuable in itself, and is anxious to obtain it from this Assembly, lest it should prove harder to obtain it from the next. If so, it is a remarkable example of the way in which the fancies of youth can stand the wear and tear of half a century of political life.

A curious question may perhaps be raised hereafter as to the precise character which is to be attributed to these forthcoming Bills. As the Report of the Committee was presented, it gave the President a veto upon all the measures passed by the Assembly. On the motion of M. DE BELCASTEL, accepted by the Committee and acquiesced in by M. THIERS, constitutional Bills have been excepted from this veto. It was at first thought that this would operate as a serious check upon M. THIERS. The Right, if they could make up their quarrel with the Right Centre, might succeed in giving a distinctly monarchical cast to the coming legislation, and M. THIERS would have no choice but to carry it into effect, whatever its character might be. Calculations which rest upon M. THIERS finding himself thus deprived of alternatives are extremely treacherous, and a very ingenious interpretation has already been started, according to which M. DE BELCASTEL's motion is not applicable to the measures about to be introduced. The preamble and the 5th Clause of the Bill now under discussion, taken together, recite that the Assembly reserving its constituent power, will proceed to pass laws upon such and such subjects. But according to this theory a law which is passed with the constituent power reserved is not a constitutional law, and M. THIERS will therefore be at liberty to veto it. As there is no authority except the Assembly, competent to declare what is and what is not a constitutional law, in the sense attached to the term in the BELCASTEL amendment, and as the decision of the Assembly upon this point as upon all others will be arrived at under the constraining influence of M. THIERS, it is not of much moment whether this interpretation is right or wrong. If the deputies should so far escape from the control in which they are usually held as to pass the Government Bills in a shape which the Government dislikes, they may be trusted to return to their allegiance after four-and-twenty hours' reflection. Whether they then rescind their own vote, or, by deciding that it is not a constitutional law, give M. THIERS the power of vetoing it, will not make much difference in the legislative result.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

THE Deceased Wife's Sister has, it seems, a way of turning up in the midst of a Ministerial crisis, like the dog at the Derby. It was doubtful on Thursday night whether there was still a Government or not; but the House of Lords may perhaps have thought that, under the circumstances, there was all the more reason for doing what it could to keep up something in the shape of law. The propriety of permitting marriage with a deceased wife's sister is a very small part of the question opened up by this impudent and notorious Bill. It is a blow aimed, not only at the sanctity of marriage, but at the authority of law. In the opinion of the promoters of the measure an Act of Parliament is binding only on those who happen to approve of its provisions. Every man his own Statute-book is the simple code of the new reformers. If you do not like a law, break it, and then make your violation of the law a reason for asking Parliament not only to repeal it, but to put things in such a position as if it had never at any time been in existence. It is obvious that this principle, if once admitted, might be found to have a dangerously extensive range of application. Lord HOUGHTON tried to tempt the House of Lords by suggesting that by passing this Bill it would put an end to an unpleasant agitation; but the Peers did not require to be warned that the success of one such agitation would immediately be the signal for many others. It is true that the scandal of breaches of the law would be effectually prevented if there were no law to break, but if this process of accommodating the law to the passions,

caprices, and irregularities of every section of the community were once entered upon, it would be apt to lead to some startling results. Widowers who want to marry their deceased wives' sisters are not the only persons who would like to have the law altered to suit their purposes. There are gentlemen who would be glad to have greater facilities than the Divorce Court at present provides for changing spouses, and others who pine for the larger freedom of polygamy. It has not yet, however, been thought desirable to abolish marriage in order to prevent adultery. Lord HOUGHTON and Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY appear to have succeeded in emancipating themselves with tolerable completeness from some of the ordinary prejudices on the subject. After all, says Lord HOUGHTON, these things are only a matter of opinion; some people think one way, some another; why should not everybody do as he likes? Lord STANLEY seemed to think he had clinched the argument when he remarked that the only reason for "the restrictions imposed in the early days of the Church was to strengthen the idea of the sanctity of marriage." We are left to infer that the idea of the sanctity of marriage has passed away with the other superstitions of the primitive Church. Lord KIMBERLEY observed that in a question of this kind consideration must be shown for the "feelings, wishes, and passions of the people"; but it is evident that the people whose feelings, wishes, and passions are to be regarded as paramount are not the whole people of the country, who for the most part are quite satisfied with the present system, but only the people who have chosen to break the law and who now ask to be relieved from the consequences of their disobedience.

Lord SELBORNE's weighty and statesmanlike speech gave emphasis to the division that followed, and will no doubt be accepted by the great body of moderate and reasonable men as a complete justification for the rejection of the Bill. This is, as he said, no party question. Nor, as far as Parliament is concerned, is it a theological or ecclesiastical question. It is really a question of social expediency. Is it for the good of the community that marriage with a deceased wife's sister should be allowed? The only persons who would be benefited by a relaxation of the law are the extremely small and insignificant faction of the community who have been seized with an ungovernable desire to marry their deceased wives' sisters. Lord SELBORNE's inquiries confirm the results of the previous inquiries undertaken by Lord HATHERLEY and by the Royal Commission of 1847. It may be doubted whether, if it were true that working-men are in the habit of contracting irregular unions of this kind, it would necessarily follow that the law should be altered in order to legalize them, regardless of all other consequences; but in point of fact it is not true. These unions are by no means common among the poor; and the attempt to represent the matter as a working-man's question is only an example of the miserable claptrap and reckless mis-statement which have distinguished the whole course of this shameless agitation. All the evidence on the subject shows that there are really very few people who are anxious to avail themselves of the freedom which the promoters of the Bill are so anxious to bestow on all the world, whether they care for it or not. If the Bill were to become law, a petty and almost microscopic minority would be enabled to indulge their eccentric and ill-regulated passions under cover of the law. This does not strike us as a very important or valuable object, and it is natural to ask what would be the cost of attaining it. One of the fundamental principles of the marriage law would be subverted, the whole system would be thrown into confusion and disorder, and all sorts of other relaxations would immediately be demanded. The social consequences of disturbing the principle of relationship by affinity would be painful in the extreme. The soft and gentle ties which once bound families together would be snapped asunder, and the sister-in-law would be thrust out into the same position as that of any other marriageable woman. Is it possible, as Lord SELBORNE asked, that a man should treat a wife's sisters as his own if he were allowed to marry them? And what becomes of the argument that wives' sisters would prove the best stepmothers children could have, if children are at the same time to be deprived of the care of an affectionate aunt? The deceased wife's sister people would seem, from their own account of themselves, or at least from the account given by their friends—for they are strangely shy of coming to the front in person—to be a very peculiar people. We are always being told of a dying wife who summons her husband and her sister to her bedside, implores them to get married, and joins their hands with a nuptial benediction. We may be permitted to doubt whether this is a familiar incident in real life. It is scarcely credible that even deceased

wife's sister people should be so lost to all sense of natural feeling as to proceed with arrangements for a new marriage over the death-bed of a wife. But if the marriage does not take place immediately, who is to take charge of the bereaved family? The sister-in-law who expects, or is at least exposed to, an offer of marriage from the widower is necessarily excluded. In short, there would then be only one way in which the woman admitted to be best fitted to be the guardian of the family in the hour of bereavement could assume that charge, and that would be by a hasty contract of marriage with the disconsolate widower.

Even assuming that such marriages are not improper in themselves, the social and domestic inconvenience and injury which would be produced by allowing them are a sufficient objection to any change. Apart from the general question of the expediency of legalizing these unions, there are also overwhelming objections to the Bill in which the anonymous agitators embodied their desires. It deals with only a small fragment of a subject which should be dealt with either not at all or as a whole. It unsettles everything, and settles nothing. It knocks away an important principle, and throws open the door for all kinds of relaxations and innovations. But the most objectionable and dangerous part of the measure is that which proposes to give retrospective sanction to marriages contracted in open and contemptuous and deliberate defiance of the law. It is obvious that to pass a measure of this kind would be simply to proclaim that nobody need obey the law unless he chooses, and to encourage disobedience. It would, as Lord SELBORNE remarked, be tantamount to declaring that a certain amount of perseverance in systematic disobedience to the law will induce Parliament not merely to alter a law, but to provide *ex post facto* legislation in favour of the whole body of law-breakers for many years past. The majority of the House of Lords against the Bill was twenty-five, or only one less than last year. Thus the House of Lords would seem to be expressing a deliberate and settled judgment, while the declining majorities of the House of Commons on the other side disclose doubt and hesitation. Under such circumstances there can be no question that the House of Lords pursued the only course that was consistent, not merely with its own dignity and independence, but with its public duty, in rejecting the Bill, and there can be equally little doubt that in doing so it represented the real opinion of the country at large. There is unfortunately no reason to hope that we have seen the last of this discreditable and unscrupulous agitation, but it may be hoped that at least its true character is now pretty well understood.

POLITICAL PORTRAITS.

A SERIES of very clever and amusing sketches of public men which lately appeared in the *Daily News* has just been reprinted in a collected form at a singularly opportune moment. It is easy to make too much of the personal element in politics; but it is an element which, if less powerful than it used to be, still exercises an important influence on the course of affairs. Indeed we have just had a striking illustration of the dislocating and embarrassing, or, to use what Mr. Disraeli calls the phrase of the hour, bewildering results which may under certain circumstances proceed from it. Agreement on a general set of principles is of course the bond of party union, but in the application of those principles there is abundant scope for the play of personal temperament and bias. "Measures not men" represents an ideal of political criticism which is neither sound nor practicable. If a measure were simply an argument, it might be tested solely on its merits; as it happens to be an executive mandate, it is necessary to consider the spirit, temper, and aims with which it is likely to be administered. In practical politics men and measures must be judged together. The author of *Political Portraits* passes in review some twenty politicians, chosen pretty much at random from both of the great parties in the State. He has apparently been a close student of recent political history, and has had good opportunities of observing near at hand the men whom he describes; and his sketches display not only keenness and penetration, but a singular freedom from party bias. A sharp incisive style and a play of somewhat caustic humour give vividness to his portraits, which, taken as a whole, remind one of nothing so much as a collection of highly finished medallions struck in steel—hard, bright, cold, and clear. Nothing can be better in their way than his sarcastic pictures of Mr. Lowe as a neglected youth who, instead of being apprenticed to a respectable trade, was allowed by his friends to throw himself away on the dead languages; of Mr. Cardwell, "the steady young man of public life, who never had a loose political thought, or an ill-regulated political passion"; of the Duke of Richmond listening with complacent curiosity while Lord Cairns explains to the Duke and the House of Lords what the Duke really meant,

although he might not have known it at the time, when he spoke a little earlier in the evening; of Mr. W. E. Forster as the Mr. Facing-Both-Ways of political life and the "best stage Yorkshireman" in the Parliamentary or any other theatre of the day; of Mr. Ayrton seeing everything—Queen, Lords, and Commons—in Ayrton, as Malebranche saw everything in the Divine Being; of Lord Halifax, a small politician hung on to a great title in a way that recalls Cicero's question about his diminutive son-in-law, "Who tied Dolabella to that sword?" In describing the race of semi-ecclesiastical statesmen and lawyers who have sprung up within the last generation, the writer observes that, "although Lord Westbury has declared that he owes his success in life to a habit of Bible reading, and to the formation of his character upon the precepts of the New Testament, he does not strictly belong to this order of lawyers and politicians." We must be thankful to a writer who does so much to redeem the dulness of political controversy, though we cannot help thinking that in some instances he is perhaps more brilliant than deep, and more witty than true. His freedom from party prejudices makes the vehemence of his personal antipathies the more remarkable. Mr. Lowe and Lord Halifax would appear to be types which he holds in especial aversion. An imputation of "something of the spirit of the servants' hall" is curiously inapplicable to one so rashly candid and independent as the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and those very defects which have always been conspicuous in Lord Halifax's public appearances might have suggested a warning against the hasty assumption that he was in every way a nonentity. Lord Melbourne, replying to an attack by Brougham, once asked the House of Lords to consider what must be the nature and strength of the objections which prevented a Government from availing itself of the services of so able and eloquent a man; and it might be urged on behalf of Lord Halifax that he must surely have great private merits in order to counterbalance his obvious deficiencies in the public part of his duties. In his wide knowledge of men and things, his mastery over business and capacity for getting quickly at the heart of a question, and in the shrewd, practical sagacity of his advice, Lord Halifax is understood to have few equals; and perhaps there never was a Chancellor of the Exchequer whom the City regarded with greater satisfaction. The suggestion that Lord Cairns was unable to retain the leadership of the House of Lords on account of "a consciousness of difference and incompatibility" between himself and the peers, such as that between "the trusted professional adviser of a great family" and his employers, and that "the brisk professional manner, the knowing look, the very attitude and gestures with which he pulls himself together to make a smart reply, as from a clever agent to a grumbling tenant or a troublesome mortgagee, had probably disagreeable associations for the majority of the peers, in addition to their aesthetic objections on grounds of taste and style," is a pure exercise of ingenious fancy. When Lord Cairns retired from this position his delicate health supplied a very simple and sufficient explanation of the step. It is necessary that a leader in the House of Lords should not only be unfailing in his attendance at the sittings of the House, but should be in the way of familiar intercourse with those whom he represents; and the physical demands of such a life must necessarily be trying to any one not in robust health. When the writer remarks that Lord Salisbury's "revolt against Liberal policy and Conservative tactics is a revolt against the very conditions of Constitutional Government," he apparently forgets Lord Salisbury's declaration during the Irish Church debates. "On those rare and great occasions," he said, "on which the national mind has fully declared itself, the House of Lords must, no doubt, yield; but there is an enormous step between that and being the mere echo of the House of Commons."

The writer of these sketches admits the general distrust with which Mr. Gladstone is regarded, but tries to make light of it. Mr. Gladstone, he says, has certainly changed his opinions from time to time; he has traversed nearly the whole interval between Lord Eldon and Mr. Bright, but then he has been forty years about it. A light mind would have taken the jump all at once, but Mr. Gladstone's "scrupulous patience and careful integrity" required time for the accomplishment of the journey step by step. The awkward thing, however, is not so much that Mr. Gladstone should have changed his opinions, but "that he should require to be reconverted to the same principles on every fresh application of them." The only consolation that can be suggested is, that, after all, "his defects as a statesman conspire to lend opportunity and effect to his special political faculties"—that is to say, to his power of giving legislative force to the policy on which the nation is supposed to have determined. In other words, if Mr. Gladstone had taken up with any principles on his own account, and had worked them out for himself, he might possibly have found himself either before or behind the nation. As it has happened, however, he has always been ready to adopt any opinion of the hour, or, as the writer puts it, to execute the mandate of the constituencies. We think this is really a very fair account of Mr. Gladstone's position as a statesman. The writer sees clearly enough that Mr. Gladstone has never possessed any fixed principles of his own, and that, even when he has adopted a set of principles, he has used them only for the purposes of the moment; but he either does not see or does not care to proclaim the whole truth on the subject. "All his life," he says, "Mr. Gladstone has been thinking aloud; you see not only the premises from which he has started, and the conclusion which he has reached, but the road by which he has travelled from one to

the other." In point of fact, Mr. Gladstone's journeys have always been the reverse way. He has invariably started from a conclusion, and then set off in search of premisses, and as the latter are not at all for his own use, but only for other people's, he has never been very particular as to what they were. The first that have come to hand have usually answered his purpose. If Mr. Gladstone were conscious of the process by which he has arrived at most of his conclusions, he would probably confess that he could say nothing more about it than that somehow they were in the air, and that he caught them as a man might catch the infection of any other epidemic. Anybody who remembers the wild and visionary reasons which Mr. Gladstone has occasionally invented in order to justify his opinions will see at once how complete is the absence of any real connexion between the two. Take, for example, his famous "flesh and blood" argument in favour of a comparatively small reduction of the qualification for household suffrage—an argument which, if he had started from it, must have led him straight away to universal suffrage; or his extraordinary proposition that an increase of voters had converted the franchise from a public trust into a private privilege which required the protection of secrecy. Nobody but Mr. Gladstone himself could suppose for a moment that he was ever in the slightest degree influenced by such absurdly irrelevant arguments in making up his mind. The truth is simply that he had already been forced by party exigencies and by the general pressure of the political atmosphere on his sensitive moral nature to the conclusion that something must be done with the franchise and the Ballot, and the hunting out of reasons was altogether an after process undertaken for the satisfaction of minds less dependent than his own on mysterious inspiration and emotional faith for their political convictions. This peculiarity of mind fully accounts for the extraordinary character of the reasons with which Mr. Gladstone sometimes startles the House of Commons, and also for their odd and inconsistent variety. It also helps to explain why the most changeable of statesmen should, when he has pitched for the moment on a policy, be the most fanatically obdurate and immovable in clinging to it. It is simply because he has nothing else to cling to. A mind that reasons can pause at any stage of the process to measure the progress it has made and test the security of its footing, and, when it has got to some final point, it can pick its way back again, step by step, and can determine how far it is wise or necessary to push a principle. But the unreasoning mind, which does not work its way logically to a conclusion, but only finds itself suddenly possessed by one, is afraid to meddle with what has come to it, as it were, in the lump, lest it should fall hopelessly to pieces. Without a firm and clear appreciation of principle, it is impossible to know what are the really material parts of any project. A member of the present Government once said of Mr. Gladstone that he hated with concentrated malignity all thoroughgoing Liberalism in every department of thought, and it is at least true that the bent of his mind and the peculiar sacerdotal groove in which it works prevents his having any sympathy with the free play of thought. He deals only in revelations of dogma which must be accepted with unquestioning faith. The reasons of the distrust with which Mr. Gladstone is regarded may be simply explained. In the first place, it is impossible to say what line of policy he may not suddenly espouse under the influence of some spasms of emotion; and, in the next place, even assuming that his policy is right, the grounds on which he may be expected to advocate it are almost certain to contain within them the seeds of mischief. Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy has been a failure to the extent to which it has fallen short of the wild and extravagant expectations for the immediate fulfilment of which he recommended it. He has excited hopes and encouraged demands of which we are already reaping some of the results.

The writer of *Political Portraits*, without apparently having much sympathy with Lord Russell, does justice to his sterling and valuable qualities. Mr. Gladstone once said very truly and generously that, if orders were given for civil as for military services, Lord Russell's breast would be studded with stars, and covered with crosses and ribands; but his achievements mainly belong to a period which is already somewhat dim and distant for the present generation. In a happy phrase the writer speaks of Lord Russell's innocent nudity of mind. He has indeed been one of the most open and candid of statesmen, and has spent his life in thinking aloud. But, however rash and inconsiderate some of his views may have been, they have always been connected with a fixed set of principles, and it is impossible not to respect the healthy, breezy freshness of his mind. Of Mr. Disraeli the writer says nothing new, perhaps for the sufficient reason that there is nothing new to be said. His "detachment from any vital interest or absorbing conviction in English politics" is attributed to the isolation of his early life, of which an interesting account is given. This freedom from prepossessions has certainly allowed free scope for the exercise of the imagination, which, as Mr. Disraeli has himself said, is in the government of nations not less important than reason; but Mr. Gladstone has had the advantage perhaps of appearing more implicitly to believe in his own convictions. The sketch of Mr. Bright is rather in the conventional style. A simple-minded writer lately took the trouble to make a list of the abuses and evils of various kinds to which Mr. Bright had at different times referred in his speeches, and to which at some later period legislation had happened to be applied, and this was presented as a list of Mr. Bright's legislative achievements. The author of *Political Portraits* appears to favour this theory of Mr. Bright's statesmanship. Mr. Bright has certainly denounced with

great vehemence and persistency abuses which have afterwards been remedied; but such statesmanship as he has shown has been purely destructive—the statesmanship of the petard and the battering-ram. He has rarely troubled himself with constructive projects, and when he has tried his hand at them they have not been found to have much practical value. The most effectual way to rouse the multitude is to persuade it that it is oppressed and cheated by a privileged class, and this is the familiar note of Mr. Bright's invective. His power has been derived, not as is suggested in this volume, from his sagacious common sense and skilful oratory, but from the passionate overflowing of a kind of religious wrath which made him pursue his opponents pretty much in the spirit of a Corsican vendetta. In his latest speech, after long silence and meditation, he could do nothing but rail against the wickedness of the people who had on political questions taken different sides from himself, and he seemed to say with Jonah, "I do well to be angry even unto death." Nobody will deny that in his time Mr. Bright has done useful work, but it is impossible to forget the rancorous and spleenetic spirit which prompted his efforts; and it may also be doubted whether he has not sometimes retarded rather than advanced the reforms he advocated by the personal bitterness which he has infused into every controversy in which he has taken part. This side of his character is omitted from the picture. The favourable aspect in which Mr. Bright is presented contrasts significantly with the depreciation which is applied to such men as Lord Derby and Mr. Forster. The remark of a foreign critic, that if Columbus had been half as sensible as Lord Derby, he would never have discovered America, is quoted with approval, and Nicias, who, as we are reminded, is responsible for the greatest disaster of Greek history, is suggested as one of the earliest types of the safe man. It may be observed, however, that the qualities which made Columbus a successful discoverer are not exactly the qualities most essential in an English Minister. "There is," we are assured, "no adviser so perilous as one who applies ordinary rules to extraordinary occasions," but we should imagine that it was scarcely less dangerous to apply extraordinary rules to ordinary occasions; and as ordinary occasions occur more frequently than extraordinary occasions, the opportunities for mischief in the latter case would necessarily be more frequent. And this is just the evil from which we have for some time been suffering. The daring pilot who is always running on the sands to show his wit may be an heroic figure, but the qualms of the crew and passengers are not perhaps altogether unreasonable. Most sensible people, we should think, would rather be in the hands of a steady-going family doctor, who treated a fit of indigestion with a simple pill, or perhaps with nothing at all except patience, than in the hands of one who thought it necessary to resort to heroic remedies for the most ordinary ailments. There are some cures which are worse than the original disease.

What appears to have most deeply impressed the author of these brilliant and pungent articles is the tendency of Parliamentary leaders to deterioration in intellectual capacity. "If," he says in the preface, "the impression left on the reader by these sketches is that in England, as in other countries, political affairs are, with four or five exceptions of high and signal capacity, in the hands of men of ability and character indeed, but of second-rate ability and commonplace character, it is probable that the same impression would be made yet more strongly by the habit of listening to the Parliamentary debates, and by some acquaintance with public business." And elsewhere he remarks, "The smaller arts of management and persuasion in detail, rather than the larger gifts of wisdom and authority, are becoming essential in politics." There is an obvious decline in the political intelligence of the House of Commons, and "the standard of admission to the Cabinet, as in some of our best regiments, has had to be lowered an inch or two." There is undoubtedly a certain amount of truth in these remarks, but we must say that what strikes us most is a falling off, not so much in intelligence, as in courage. It is impossible to compare the younger race of statesmen with those of the previous generation, some of whom still survive, without being struck by the hesitation and timidity and the sort of self-annihilation which are characteristic of the former; and the contrast is still more impressive if we go back another generation. It would seem to be supposed that it is no longer the business of statesmen to lead opinion, or indeed to have any opinions of their own; all they have to do is to listen for orders and to execute what is called the "mandate of the constituencies" in a smart, business-like way. It is true that under a system of popular Government a Minister can do nothing unless he carries the people along with him; but, although the people have the right, if they choose, to dictate what shall be done, it does not follow that statesmen are therefore bound to renounce their own judgment, and simply to wait for their cue from the streets. What is wanted is that public men should have the courage to think for themselves, to say boldly what they think, and to refuse to be parties to any policy which they do not heartily and honestly approve. It is the sycophancy and subserviency to vulgar clamour of which Mr. Gladstone has set the fashion which is the principal cause of political deterioration.

MOVING HOUSE.

A MONGST the miseries which for various reasons we agree to treat rather with ridicule than with sympathy, few are more acute than those connected with a change of house. It would be a

curious inquiry why any evils which in themselves are real and serious should be regarded as placing their victim beyond the circle of a common humanity. Sea-sickness involves as much unhappiness for the time as the loss, say, of a first cousin; if more transitory, it is more acute for the moment, for few people lose their appetite for a day on the death of a relation, and still less do they contemplate suicide as desirable under the circumstances. Yet one of these is almost an invariable, and the other a very common, result of sea-sickness. We sympathize, it would seem, only with those forms of suffering which are susceptible of poetic treatment; and in other cases we feel—to alter the ordinary saying—that there is a comic side to the misfortunes of our best friends. This excuse, whatever its value, is not quite sufficient to account for the callous indifference with which we generally regard the victim of a change of houses. For surely there is something poetical about the feelings of a human being torn from the building which has become almost a part of himself. He is not, we assume, about to cross the ocean, or to break off any habit of familiarity. He is merely moving to a distance of a few hundred yards because some intrusive railway has demolished his former dwelling-place; or because an increase of his family, or a desire for better accommodation, or the imperious wish of the ladies of his household, has compelled him to shift his anchorage. However slight the change may be, he is breaking innumerable threads of association, of whose force he was never before sensible. For many of them it is probable that he is hopelessly unable to account. He cannot tell how many social meetings have hallowed particular rooms for him, and left behind an odour perceptible to the imagination, if not to the senses. He can only dimly guess that certain marked stages in his domestic life have been connected in the background of his consciousness with particular rooms or pieces of furniture. He feels, but he is unable to say why he feels, that his imagination is not so easily kindled, and that his pen does not run so easily, in the new and commodious study whose charms were set before him in the most glaring colours, as in the queer old dingy room where every angle, inconvenient as it might be, had somehow learnt a language of its own. He resembles the schoolboy who was reduced to sudden imbecility when the malice of his rivals had cut off the button which he always fingered in moments of difficulty. A man grows into a house as he grows into a pair of shoes; and he feels the change like a hermit-crab dislodged from the old shell to which his figure had gradually adapted itself. There is surely something pathetic, though there is of course much that is trivial, about such sufferings. Hawthorne argues in the *House of the Seven Gables* that all this attachment to old places is an old-world superstition; and that in the coming days we shall be wiser, and change a house with the same facility as we now change a coat. Our remote descendants will revert to the nomad state, though their tents will be made of brick and mortar instead of canvas. They will scorn to be bound by sentiment to any particular plot of ground. It is hard to prophesy what may be the mental condition of our remote posterity. A day may come when patriotism and family feeling may be regarded as idle superstitions; and in that era, an attachment to any special lump of matter will be a weakness of which every luminary of the twenty-third century will be heartily ashamed. But meanwhile every person in whom the imagination is not quite an obsolete faculty clings more or less to an ancient domicile. He feels a perceptible wrench upon quitting it; and is painfully sensible that he is passing one more milestone on his road to the grave. We do not grow old at a uniform rate. Our steady downhill progress is varied by abrupt descents and sudden breaches of continuity. The stream of life has its rapids and its cascades as well as its smoother stretches; and the change of a house generally forms one of those conspicuous epochs by which we count our history. It marks one of the revolutions in our little kingdom, which may be in other respects for the better or the worse, but which is at any rate a step nearer to the end. Everybody knows how the whole character of a friendly meeting is often changed by the scene in which it takes place. A dinner party which would be sociable and talkative in a room of corresponding size becomes disagreeably noisy in a smaller, and painfully decorous in a more magnificent, apartment. In the same way, by some subtle and untraceable influence, our whole system of life seems to take its colour from its surroundings; the family whom we were all glad to see in Tyburn somehow becomes disagreeable when transplanted to Mayfair, or vice versa; and our private history is thus divided into acts, in which the scenery has more importance than we are sometimes willing to acknowledge. However this may be, the mere fact of cutting loose so many old associations as are necessarily destroyed in a domestic transmigration has something almost solemn about it to the mind which is not ultra-philosophical; and an optimist would have hoped, for the credit of human nature, that the concomitant sufferings were hallowed by the deeper emotions which they typify, instead of rendering the emotion itself ridiculous.

Unluckily it is not so. Undertakers, as we know, have succeeded in making a funeral almost ridiculous and quite vexatious to the spirit of man. Upholsterers are equally successful in casting an air of ridicule upon the parting, not from a lady, but from a house. It is out of the question to adopt an air of dignity. A man leaving No. 99 in a square cannot look like a baron driven from his ancestral castle. His sufferings may be quite as deep. The poor beetle which we drive out of his cranny may feel as

great a pang as a millionaire turned out of his palace. But with all our benevolence, we only laugh at him. The man, at this possible crisis of his life, is a victim to those paltry cares which we agree to treat with contempt. He is harassed by wretched little perplexities about doors that will not fit, and blinds that will not draw up, and wardrobes that persist with an obstinacy worthy rather of animated beings than of mere material objects, in refusing to fit any available corner. A day comes on which he ought to be overwhelmed with conflicting sentiments at parting from his old penates. He has rehearsed the scene in imagination, and is prepared to shed an appropriate tear on quitting for ever the spot where he took his last leave of a near relation, or where his first-born child was presented to him. Before he has time to rise to the appropriate pitch of sentiment, a rabble rout of grimy workmen has diffused itself throughout every room in his house. They are tearing down his pictures, his books, and his china with a zeal worthy of German troops taking farewell of a French village. The only emotion which is naturally suggested by their appearance is a thirst for some fluid capable of slaking throats which are exposed to continual whirlwinds of time-honoured dust. The poor fragments of furniture detached from their accustomed resting-place seem suddenly to lose their beauty like a gathered flower. The rooms themselves become dreary like a field invaded by a flight of locusts. Sentiment is obviously out of place; and the only hope is to preserve sufficient temper whilst endeavouring to appeal to the tender mercy of these tyrannous invaders. The wretched householder feels himself to be little more than a useless obstacle, which has no real right to exist. He has fondly trusted in promises that his new abode will be swept and garnished in a surprisingly short space of time. If from want of experience he has been rash enough to put some kind of faith in these lavish assurances, he is speedily and rudely undeceived. A dreary and irritating period is in store for him. If he retires to some remote refuge, the whole ingenuity of his tormentors will be racked to put everything where he particularly wished that it should not be. If he remains at his post heroically, he will be tempted to think that furniture, as Butler thought of nations, may go mad; and he will be driven to the misanthropical conclusion that nobody ever keeps his promises, and in particular that that model of his species, the British workman, means, when he says that he will do a thing to-day, that he will begin to do some part of it to-morrow week.

What, to select one special scene of misery, can be more wretched than the fate of the man who really loves his library as every good man should do? We do not speak of libraries in the grander sense of the word—of collections of rare and precious editions, or of solid masses of literature which require special edifices to contain them. The fortunate proprietors of such libraries may be assumed to be rich enough to pass over their troubles to other people. We are thinking rather of such a modest library as frequently twines itself round the affections of a man of moderate means. It contains books upon which he has scrawled caricatures of his schoolmasters; and prizes marked with the arms of the college at which he distinguished himself; and miscellaneous books of no great value, but interesting because they have been picked up at bookstalls, or in out-of-the-way Continental towns; and cheap editions of celebrated authors which have been companions of travel and have provided amusement in leisure moments; with just a sprinkling of more ambitious volumes, which he has ventured to buy whilst carefully counting the cost. In the course of a few years each book has found its own appropriate nook on the shelves; he could find it in the dark, and would miss it if it were kindly borrowed by a friend; the whole library has acquired a certain organic unity; and even whilst quietly sitting in his chair he can imbibe the aroma of each division by allowing his eyes to ramble aimlessly over the familiar books. When it has been transported by the rude hands of illiterate workmen, who regard a book as though it were simply a thing, and has been shot down on the floor with no more ceremony than coals are deposited in our cellars, the sight is as pathetic as the mangled remains of an animal. It requires some nerve to begin the weary task of once more reducing chaos to some new kind of order, which yet cannot for a long period be as familiar as the old. It shocks one's sense of propriety to see the strange discords which have been produced by the fortuitous combinations of thoughtless hands. Stray volumes of Voltaire are mixed up with Butler and Jeremy Taylor; Shakespeare is being crushed under a pile of Blue-books or treatises on Political Economy, and Charles Lamb suffocated amongst a crowd of the books which no gentleman's library should be without. And then, as he turns over the volumes, he is lucky if disagreeable revelations do not obtrude themselves. Possibly he will discover that some of his cherished treasures bear the uneffaced inscription of a friend's name; and he will have to choose between conscious dishonesty and superhuman heroism. Then he will find presentation copies of poems, which he foolishly omitted to acknowledge by return of post, and dared not acknowledge afterwards, and which now stare him in the face with a reminder of neglected duties. Elsewhere he has a melancholy thrill as he turns up again some ponderous volume of history or science, speaking of studies of which he zealously entered the portal, but somehow failed to get much further. There are books that recall friendships now dead and buried, and files of dusty pamphlets reviving old scenes of intellectual contest in which he wasted his powers; and books which he reviewed abusively when he ought to have discovered the advent of a new genius, and many

more to which he was unduly clement when he ought to have slashed them with critical vigour; and possibly writings of his own which have been forgotten by everybody but himself, and which he had wished to forget also. But it would be endless to speak of the associations which may be suggested by once more disturbing the slumbers of the works that were resting so peacefully on their shelves. Nobody can have gone through such a task without many pangs of more or less acuteness.

A library is doubtless the most living part of the contents of a house. Nothing else excites so many emotions in the bosom of the wretched being doomed to leave his house. Yet his sufferings are generally treated with ridicule, and he is blandly informed that things will shake down and all will come right in that singularly indefinite period, "a day or two." It may be so; but human life does not include a large number of "days or two."

EXTINCT JOURNALISM.

ONE of the most interesting objects of the South Kensington Museum during last summer was the glass case which contained specimens of the successive editions of the *Times*. Visitors learnt how that journal gradually expanded from modest shape and indifferent letterpress to its present ample proportions; and they might also picture to themselves the transformation of the journalist from a mere chronicler of passing events to a leader of thought and civilization. But it would have been more interesting if the case could have been opened and the volumes inspected. We shall now endeavour partly to supply the gap from some volumes of a deceased journal which have fallen into our hands, and which have the double merit of containing a faithful picture of the social habits of our grandfathers in England and in India.

Towards the close of the last century a weekly paper was started in Calcutta, known to several generations of Anglo-Indians as the *Hukar*. The nearest English translation of this title would be the "Courier." After a time the weekly issue was exchanged for a daily; the circulation increased; the paper flourished; some of the best names in Eastern journalism used it as their vehicle of expression; and it recently ended an existence of more than seventy years by absorption into another contemporary. It appears to have occurred to the editor of the *Hukar* in its first season of 1795, that a few woodcuts would enhance the merits of the paper; and accordingly in the first page there is the figure of a man with the motto *Pede fausto*, intended to represent the well-known courier or runner who, before the days of mail-carts and railroads, carried the correspondence of the public all over the peninsula. In reality this person is a wiry, dark-skinned, and perspiring native, who, with a minimum of clothing and a wallet slung over his shoulder, runs a post of six miles in the space of an hour and a quarter in fine dry weather, and in two or, it may be, three hours, when ways are foul. The figure in the woodcut is, on the contrary, that of a well-fed and portly person adorned with a turban and clad in a coat and wide Turkish trousers, resembling the traditional Levantine pirate or a burlesque. The absurdity of this appears to have attracted notice, for after a few issues this figure disappears, though the motto remains. It is tolerably clear that other illustrations were not drawn on the spot on stone or wood, but were supplied from England, and inserted without the slightest regard for dramatic propriety and consistency. A mansion in "Chourangi," and a lower roomed house (i.e. a bungalow) with a flat roof, near "Tirett's bazaar," are facsimiles of the red-brick houses tenanted by the village doctor or attorney in a post town in England; a horse is advertised for sale, led in by an English jockey in topboots and a striped waistcoat; and the auctioneer himself, clad in a wig of Dr. Johnson's type, appears at a table, nodding to well-dressed Englishmen and Englishwomen, instead of to the motley crowd of subalterns, civilians, and native clerks that frequent a Presidency auction mart. We must premise that, for political reasons which we need not stop to explain, the selection of topics was comparatively limited. The Indian press was not practically free until the reign of Lord William Bentinck, nor legally franchised until the administration of his successor, Metcalfe. Editors were not allowed to discuss measures affecting the discipline of the native army, or such sacred subjects as the religious feelings of the natives, the good faith and loyalty of our allies, the motives of Governors and Councils, and the foreign policy of the Empire. The papers were consequently made up of advertisements, official and social, items of local news, storms and atmospheric phenomena, and very copious extracts from the European journals. It would be useless to ransack the files of a Calcutta journal of the last century to find out what the editor thought about Scindia or the Oude princesses, or what were the views of the Anglo-Indian and the native community as to the equality of all men in the eye of the law. But it would be no difficult task to say how our predecessors lived and amused themselves; what wine they drank, what books they read, and what strange customs they either tolerated or cherished. Lotteries on a grand scale were in fashion, and were patronized by gentlemen "of the first respectability," leading merchants, civilians, and barristers. The number of tickets varied from 3,000 to 5,000. Each ticket cost rather more than 10*l.* The prizes were 500*l.* or sometimes 1,000*l.* in number; the blanks from 2,500 to 4,000; and in the former were single sums of 10,000*l.* and 5,000*l.* and batches

of nine hundred averaging 15*l.* each. Then gentlemen are invited to take tickets in a lottery for a "garden house," sum total 800*l.*, at eighty tickets of 10*l.* each. Private and public theatricals were then, as now, a resource against ennui. Residents are told to subscribe to a new comedy in five acts, termed *The Mirror*, "the scene of which is laid in Calcutta." H. M.'s 70th Regiment was to give *The Reprisal, or, The Tars of England*, followed by the farce of *The Old Maid*, and the editor patriotically reminds his readers that the parts will be filled by the same veterans who had lately distinguished themselves on the Mysorean Theatre at the representation of the Siege of Seringapatam.

The following examples of the severity of our criminal code ought to be remembered by all who wish to appreciate the labours of Romilly and Brougham. The sentences, we must observe, were not passed by an Indian magistrate in the interior, administering a barbarous relic of Mahomedan dominion without the aid of a barrister or the publicity of a press, but they emanated from learned judges dealing out law as it would have been dealt out by Lord Kenyon or Lord Mansfield. Two natives "of the Gentoo caste" convicted of stealing in a dwelling-house at Madras, were executed; and the same fate was experienced on August 11, 1795, by five Portuguese and one Hindoo, convicted of burglary. They were hanged "at the meeting of four roads near the office of the Justices of the Peace," in presence of a military guard of Englishmen and Sepoys, and "an immense concourse of people." About the same time one Lochan, for stealing half a gold-piece and some silver ornaments, was publicly whipped in the Burra Bazaar, and one Kanai Doh was also whipped from the south end to the north end of the same locality, and then back again. An Englishman for a like offence was similarly chastised, but privately, and all three prisoners suffered imprisonment besides. Two privates of the 3rd European battalion, for numerous robberies, were imprisoned for two years and burnt in the hand. At Bombay two natives had each fifty lashes and stood in the pillory; and for the serious crimes of mutiny and sedition five Sepoys were blown away from guns, and three were hanged. Our catalogue ends with the Governor of Madras—a Lord Hobart then as now—under some judicial powers which the Executive exercises to this day in certain cases, sentencing a servant of the Nawab of the Carnatic to capital punishment for having ordered a man to be flogged to death. We gather, however, that, in consideration of what the French term "des circonstances atténuantes," the extreme sentence was not carried out.

If judicial penalties were then very different, petty or local events were occasionally very similar to what may be read in any Indian journal to this day. We are told, for instance, of a violent storm at Chittagong, which had levelled bungalows, torn up trees by the roots, stranded or sunk half-a-dozen sloops, killed a "great number" of natives, but only injured "one gentleman"; of a like disaster at Ganjam on the Coromandel coast; of an alligator which had swallowed a colt; of two gentlemen drowned by the upsetting of a *bullock*; of a complaint against certain Balasore bearers—i.e. domestic servants from a district of Orissa—who refused to touch a tallow candle for reasons of caste. We read how the heat in April had been 100° in the shade at 3 P.M., and how the crop of pepper had failed on the Malabar coast; how Mr. Erskine's speech in defence of Hardy had been received too late for insertion in "this morning's issue"; how perjury ought to be made a capital offence, because natives "stick at nothing"; how Mr. Squaretoes (*sic*) had been driven to distraction for fifteen sleepless nights and tedious days because his neighbour had collected a large supply of ducks, geese, and pigs for his sea stock, in addition to fifty noisy native carpenters; how one Captain Hay authorised the editor to deny that he was about to give a ball and supper on board of his ship, on the ground that it had been set on fire by a native craft, and the fire had been promptly extinguished; how Agrestis was prepared to enliven the pages of the *Hukar* with sketches of "General Ecclesiastical History"; and, lastly, how a subscriber in the year 1796 exhorted from his correspondence a letter written many years before, describing, first, the death of one Gokul Chandra, who had been the Banian of Governor Verelst, on the banks of a muddy creek, and then, immediately afterwards, the sacrifice of Gokul's young wife, aged twenty, by the well-known rite of Suttee. This contributor adds that he read the letter to a near relation of Gokul, who admitted that he had stood near the pile, and that everything happened just as described at length.

From Suttee, and alligators, and tropical heat, and Anglo-Indian customs, we turn to the picture of social life in England presented by the copious extracts from the journals of the day. The press seemed to have filled its columns by proceedings in Parliament, by speeches on political and other trials in the Court of King's Bench, and by extracts from Continental papers about the Stadholder, the Seven United Provinces, and the French Revolution and Convention, varied by poetical epitaphs on distinguished personages, and contributions from Pye, the Post-Laureate. The journals most quoted are the *Star*, the *Morning Herald*, and the *Sun*; and, occasionally, the *Leyden Gazette*. Leading articles are not very common, though we do find divers patriotic effusions about defence against the "common enemy," and invectives against "adulation offered, with the most degrading servility, at the shrine of the Corsican." This last appears in a short article of the *Hukar* itself, but it is capped by a lengthy obituary notice in England, of the Royalist Bishop of Arras, who had been "hated and persecuted by the Corsican assassin and poisoner." About the same time we find a meeting held at the Thatched House

Tavern in St. James's Street regarding the measures to be taken to protect the country from invasion. Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Sturges Bourne (of whom Sydney Smith wrote in the Peter Plymley Letters that he would burn his capitulating hand like Scrovoli), Lord Hood, and Lord Camden, were present. Lord Hawkesbury, from the chair, declared that the "danger with which the country was now threatened exceeded that which had been experienced at any other period." The greatest loyalty and unanimity prevailed. The carters of London offered 1,000 horses and 420 carts or waggons, whenever called on. Jobmasters declared their readiness to allow the nobility and gentry to devote horses, when on hire, under certain conditions, to the same object; and schedules were circulated both at the meeting and in the districts near the metropolis, to be filled up with carts and horses by patriotic persons. Mr. Secretary Yorke, it is to be observed, had already offered his "chariot and horses," holding three inside and one out, with the service of "his own coachman" to boot. About the same time we have an account of a Lawless Court held by the owner of the manor of Rochford, in Essex. The proceedings took place at midnight, on the first Wednesday after Michaelmas Day, in the open air, on King's Hill. Everything was done in whispers; the minutes were written with coal, instead of pen and ink; and absent tenants were fined double their rents for every hour's absence. This custom, we are told, was intended to keep up the remembrance of a conspiracy of the inhabitants against their absent master, detected by him on his way home. Then Blanchard, the aeronaut, makes his sixty-sixth ascent, with nine other persons, 1,500 feet above the earth, where four ladies and four gentlemen dance a quadrille, until compelled to descend by the illness of three of the party. A Mahomedan jubilee takes place at St. George's-in-the-East, along the New Road, Cannon Street, Ratcliff Highway, and Shadwell; it was characterized by pantomimic dances, incense, and hymns from the Koran, and was intended to celebrate the commencement of the New Year and the translation of Mahomed into Paradise. The Duchess of York, the aunt of our Queen, faints during divine service at Weybridge, to the dismay of the congregation. A woman died at Abbey Lanercost, named Jane Forester, in the one hundred and thirtieth year of her age, who remembered the sale of a horse's head for half-a-crown during the siege of Carlisle by Cromwell in 1647, and who had a daughter living aged one hundred and three. Particulars are given of the execution of Robert Watt at Edinburgh. The prisoner was drawn on a hurdle from the Castle to the Tolbooth with his back to the horse, the executioner being seated opposite, with a large axe in his hand. Death was inflicted by hanging, but the body was cut down and stretched on a table, when the executioner severed the head at two blows, and displayed it to the multitude as "that of a traitor." It is a relief to turn from this picture, crowded with sensational details which we do not care to reproduce, to a critique on the "girls of the period," or what are termed "the masculine women of fashion." "Their hunting, shooting, driving, cricketing, faroing, and skating present a monstrous chaos of absurdity; not only making day and night hideous, but the sex equivocal." Further, we have notices of a fine young fellow, of respectable parents, who, having robbed a pieman of some halfpence on Hounslow Heath, was sentenced to death, but pardoned on condition of serving in the Royal navy; of the rise of the Chouans on the Loire and in Brittany, who were first smugglers and then Royalists; of the trial of Horne Tooke, and of the acquittal of Hardy, when Erskine's coach was dragged home in triumph by the spectators, in spite of his protests; of the completion of the telegraph from the Land's End to the Nore; of the death of Big Ben Bryant the pugilist, whoseistic merits are immortalized in a poetical epitaph as "bold Johnson's dread and Britain's glory"; of the hounds of Sir C. Turner, who hunted every other day for the amusement of the English forces at Arnheim on the Continent; of divers duels, and trials consequent thereon, which generally terminated in a prompt acquittal; of a sermon preached to the Loughborough Volunteers, embodied for the purpose of "fighting against the common enemy"; of the death of Prince Lee Boo and the joy of the islanders therewith; and of the intended abolition of the tax on "card-money," which is denounced as "an imposition upon hospitality, and an insult to friendship."

We could multiply extracts, but have only room for one more topic, and that is the marriage of the Prince of Wales. The anthem performed on this occasion was composed by Handel for the Prince's grandfather, Prince Frederick. The ceremony is described with all the fulness and liveliness of detail usual with Court chroniclers. We have the dresses of the bridesmaids; the tears shed by the Prince, when the King kissed him no less than thirty times; and the civility of the "first gentleman in Europe," who made Lord Harcourt a present of his own hat. Of course, the Court muse was not silent, and some magniloquent lines describe Apelles painting Venus; and then declare that, had Caroline of Brunswick lived at that time, the Grecian painter, instead of combining the charms and graces of several maidens into one, would have made "his finished plan" from her alone. Some ill-natured remarks are attributed to Lady J.—evidently Lady Jersey—regarding a certain duke and duchess; the demeanour of the Marquis of S.—is particularly described; and it is noted that one of the "Veteran Corps of the Maids of Honour" was distinctly heard to say "Amen" at one part of the ceremony. These incidents were confined to the proceedings inside the Chapel Royal. Outside, we regret to say, there was a little unpleasantness. For, though Mrs. Fitzherbert's empty White House was the first illuminated in

Pall Mall, "with green lamps, branched like a forsaken willow," the chair of the Earl of Chatham was smashed to pieces, and his lordship had to "bolt" into the shop of Carr, the Pall Mall hatter. Lord Mansfield was "roughly handled," and termed one of the P—'s guinea-pigs; and the Marquis of Buckingham, who had forgotten that it was a night of rejoicing, had his memory jogged by the populace in "their rough manner." It must be confessed that these reminiscences have a disagreeable flavour about them, when illustrated by the subsequent career of the Royal couple. A considerable gap in morals and manners separates the end of the last century from the era of Victoria. But the difference between the rule of Lord Cornwallis or of Lord Wellesley in India, and that of Lord Northbrook, is in reality that not of eighty years, but of some two centuries of progress.

THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS BILL.

WE hinted some time back that Sir John Lubbock, at once banker and antiquary, who had done so good a turn to the bankers, was likely to do as good a turn to the antiquaries also. We have before us the fruit of his praiseworthy purposes in the shape of a Bill "for the Preservation of Ancient National Monuments." It wears on its back the names of four other members besides Sir John Lubbock himself, and the appearance of Mr. Beresford Hope and Mr. Osborne Morgan as fellow-workers may perhaps be taken as some sign that the proposed measure is not of a sectarian or partisan kind. How far the proposal of Parliamentary interference to save some at least of the ancient monuments of the land has been at all caused by the cry which went up at the late brutal havoc at Dorchester we do not pretend to guess. At any rate, here is a measure which, if it becomes law, will at least do something; and, where as yet nothing has been done at all, it will be a great point to secure the doing of anything.

We do not undertake to examine the technical framework of the Bill. It provides a Commission, to consist of the Enclosure Commissioners, strengthened by certain other persons likely to take a special interest in ancient remains. These Commissioners will have full immediate powers for the preservation of certain monuments named in the Bill, and they may, under certain circumstances, acquire powers for the like preservation of two other classes of monuments. We presume that it is expected that the work of the Commission will practically be in the hands of the experts, and, as the persons named are likely to be found in parts of the United Kingdom very far removed from one another, it is kindly provided that they shall be able to act without in every case meeting face to face.

We assume that the list of monuments which is added to the Bill, and to which the powers of the Commissioners are to be applied at once, is meant to be only tentative, and that the framers of the measure will be glad of any suggestions for the increase of the list. A clause, of which we shall presently speak, provides for the extension of the powers of the Commissioners to other monuments besides those named in the Act, but it will clearly be better to name as many as possible in the Act itself. On looking through the list, our first notion was that it was meant to be confined to what are commonly known as primeval monuments only. Almost the first thing that we looked for in the list was Dorchester Dykes; as they are not there, we suppose that they are by this time too far gone for any mortal Commissioners to preserve them. But the amphitheatre at the Dorsetshire Dorchester is put down in the list. It is therefore not intended to exclude Roman remains as such; and, if so, we at once ask why the list of Roman remains is not much longer? To begin with the greatest work of all, why is not the Roman wall put under the protection of the Commissioners? If the Dorchester amphitheatre is to be preserved, why not those at Silchester and Caerleon? Why not Silchester walls, and all that is within them? Why not Wroxeter? Why not Burgh Castle? The multangular tower of Eboracum may be thought to be safe in the keeping of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society; but there is another piece of the wall of the city which may well need protection; so there is at Leicester; so there is at Lincoln; the Newport Gate, if not quite the peer of the *Porta Martis* of Rheims or the *Porta Nigra* of Trier, is worthy of keeping, both as a memorial of the colony of Lindum and as the arch of triumph through which the Conqueror must have marched to take possession of one of the noblest prizes of his warfare. If any of the monuments of the land are held to need legislative protection, is Anderida itself, the spot which Briton and Roman, Englishman and Norman, may alike claim as their own, to be left without a defender? These are all spots which occur to us on the spur of the moment as spots, which if Roman remains are to be admitted, ought to hold a high place in the catalogue. Further research on the suggestions of persons familiar with various districts might doubtless make the list much longer.

Indeed even among the primeval monuments themselves there are some omissions which surprise us. Stonehenge of course is there and Avebury and Kit's Coty-House, the cromlech in Gower which fantastically bears the name of Arthur, and the scene of his real victory at Badbury. The two famous giants' chambers, Uleybury in Gloucestershire and Stoney Littleton in Somerset, are both there. But the vast hill-fort of Worlebury, where Cawlin overcame the Britons, and where the researches of Mr. Warre brought to light the skeletons of victors and vanquished as

they fell in the grasp of death, finds no place in the list. Yet few monuments better deserve protection, and few need it more keenly, damaged as it has been already, and threatened as it daily is with utter destruction. Devonshire and Cornwall, out of all the remains with which Dartmoor and the Land's End district are studded, contribute only one monument each—the Three Hurlers in Cornwall, and the Grey Wethers in Devonshire. The primeval antiquities of South Wales are not summed up in the one cromlech of Arthur's Quoit; to mention one only out of twenty, there is a huge monument of the same class near Dyffryn, in Glamorgan, which, if Sir John Lubbock does not know of, the Home Secretary may. To be sure, under the third clause of the Bill it would be possible to include all these monuments and any others of the same kind within its operation. The clause runs thus:—

This Act may, with the consent of the Treasury, and subject to appeal, in the manner hereinafter in this Act provided, be applied by the Commissioners to any British, Roman, or Saxon remains, or to any monument which is in the opinion of the Commissioners of the like kind as any of the monuments specified in the said first schedule, and which is not situate in any park, garden, or pleasure ground, and which neither is nor forms part of nor includes the ruins of any castle, fortress, abbey, religious house, or ecclesiastical building.

We confess that we should be a little puzzled if we were called on to define British or Saxon remains. What is to become of those who, not without strong show of reason, hold cromlechs and such like to be the works of a race earlier than the Britons? What will become of those sticklers for accuracy who might argue that in Yorkshire or Lincolnshire there could not be such a thing as a Saxon monument of any age, while in Hampshire or Somerset the name would apply to a work of yesterday? To be sure the words which next follow have a sanitary force, as they take in "any monument," whether British, Roman, Saxon, or anything else, "which is in the opinion of the Commissioners of the like kind as any of the monuments specified in the said first schedule." This would of course take in anything, without offence to the Danish antiquaries at the one end or to Mr. Ferguson at the other. Still it is better to avoid a clumsy and antiquated nomenclature, if it can be done. Yet perhaps talk about Saxon remains is not wonderful in a Session of Parliament which has listened to the proposal to shut out "Modern History" from University teaching, without its authors deigning to tell us at which of the many proposed dates from the call of Abraham to the French Revolution the line between Ancient and Modern History is to be drawn. This same clause, it will be seen, leaves all military and ecclesiastical remains unprotected; indeed we are not sure whether the word fortress might not shut out some of the Roman buildings for which we have already pleaded. We should be glad to put mediæval remains under the same protection as primeval remains. To destroy Tintern Abbey or Chepstow Castle would surely be as great an act of barbarism as to destroy Stonehenge itself. Still we are not disposed to find fault, as our feeling is rather that of thankfulness if we can get anything at all preserved; and it strikes us that the words which shut out castles and abbeys and churches would take in domestic buildings, if they are "not situate in any park, garden, or pleasure ground." Through this provision we might possibly find a loophole for saving here and there a few examples of a class of monuments which stand in greater danger than any other.

There is further consolation for us in Clause VII. The two classes of monuments of which we have already spoken—those namely which are put in the schedule and those to which the Act may be hereafter applied by virtue of Clause III.—may under the further provision of Clause VI. be put under the care of the Commissioners without the consent of their owners. Clause VII. seems further to allow the Act to be, with the consent of their present owners, applied to monuments of any class or of any date whatsoever:—

This Act may, with the consent of the Treasury, be applied by the Commissioners to a monument of whatsoever kind and wheresoever situate, if the following persons give their consent to its application, namely:—

(a) The occupier or occupiers of the site of the monument; and
(b) Every person entitled to any beneficial interest in possession of the site of the monument, &c.

And other means are provided in the same clause by which the Commissioners may become possessed of monuments of any kind. A man may seemingly sell his castle or abbey to the Commissioners as much as his cromlech or his amphitheatre. Or a prudent father, who fears that his son may have less respect for antiquity than he has himself, may under another part of the same clause make over his interest in the monument to the Commissioners. The Bill, in short, will at once secure the preservation of certain classes of monuments, and it will make the preservation of monuments of any class a much easier business than it is now. Primeval monuments are to be put under what we may call compulsory protection; the protection of mediæval monuments still remains optional; but the Bill will make it much easier to preserve them from the caprices of momentary owners.

We need not go into the details of the powers which the measure confers on the Commissioners. But they come generally to this—that no "injury" will be allowed to be done to any monument brought under the Act without the consent of the Commissioners; and that if any question arises between the Commissioners and any one who thinks himself aggrieved by anything that they do, there will be a power of appeal to one of the superior courts of law or equity. It should be noted that the word "injury" in this Bill is used as a technical term, with a meaning which is defined in an explanatory

clause. It has a rather odd sound when we hear of a person designing to "injure" a monument and of the Commissioners giving their consent to the "injury" of the monument. We might here stop to make a discourse on the abuse of language. In etymological strictness it can never be right to do "injury" to a monument or to anything else, because "injury" (*injuria, adūia*) in itself implies something morally wrong, while to do mere physical harm or hurt (*dannum, βαρεῖν*), whether to a monument or to anything else, may often be needful. People talk nowadays of a man having received an "injury" in his bodily frame, though it may have been done by sheer accident or in the most righteous operation of war; yet the word still keeps so much of its old force that there seems something queer when we read of a man deliberately purposing to "injure" anything, and of a public body giving their consent to his doing so.

It is clear that the measure might well have had a wider sphere, although the compulsory preservation of mediæval monuments is, as things are, impossible; yet at least it would have been a gain greatly to enlarge the list of primeval monuments to which the Bill is to be applied at once. But perhaps it is not wise to ask for too much at once. It may indeed fairly be asked that the list may be enlarged in Committee. While we still cherish the hope of some day getting yet more, the Bill will at all events give us a great deal in a department in which we have hitherto had nothing.

ITALY FOR NERVOUS PATIENTS.

IT is presumable that every state of society contains some rough provision for the evils peculiar to it. Thus it is commonly recognized that one distinguishing bane of our present civilization is the great liability to excessive brain work; and its accepted remedy is a foreign tour, which has only recently become a possibility to a considerable number of persons. The reasons for adopting such means of restoration for those who are not physically incapacitated for travel, and to whom change of scene and agreeable diversion are more than a vacuous repose, are self-evident. They apply moreover with especial force to the inhabitants of a climate which M. Taine has recently painted with such merciless fidelity. There seems, too, to be every probability that these mischievous effects of our modern struggle for existence will, for some time at least, be on the increase; and one may therefore reasonably expect to find a growing number of the highest class of vertebrates seeking the remedy of disordered cerebrum in that species of irregular migration known as modern touring.

That Italy should so commonly be selected as the aim of these migrations is natural enough. The class of invalids to which we now refer is largely recruited from the professional ranks of society, and may be supposed to possess some amount of historical culture and artistic taste. To such minds no other country, one supposes, offers the same extent and variety of interest. A slight acquaintance with classic history will suffice to invest with attractive associations the ruins of Rome and Paestum, the charming bay of Baia, and the beautiful shores of Sicily. The least artistic minds, too, may find some variety of pleasure among such copious treasures as the sculptures and bronzes of ancient Rome, the mural paintings of Pompeii, and the many fine pictures of the several Italian schools. In addition to these relics of the past, we find in Italy a natural scenery, a variety of race, a set of costumes and manners, and a form of language which are pretty certain to present points of interest to the artistic, the scholarly, and the simply curious order of minds. Not only are there offered these ample and various enjoyments, but also a climate that permits one to take the fullest advantage of them. Although, as every traveller in Italy knows, winds may at times be very bleak, and rains heavy and persistent, and during these inclemencies but little of our wonted domestic comfort is to be obtained, yet one is rarely precluded for many days in succession from all outdoor excursions. Finally, the less robust traveller may find here a tolerable amount of social order, and some of the newer conveniences of modern civilization.

The bare enumeration of these sources and conditions of enjoyment seems enough to justify the high reputation that Italy has obtained as a grateful minister to jaded minds. The hard-worked professional man who, tied by his duties at home, casts a wistful glance at his map, and fondly supposes that two or three months in the sunny Peninsula would restore nervous energy and mental tone, appears to be simply rational in his view of things. Yet here as elsewhere one strongly suspects that fancy is apt to paint the remote and unattainable in hues a little too brilliant. However certain it may be that a tour in Italy affords abundant variety of pleasing diversion, it is commonly attended with a few little drawbacks which are rarely perhaps taken into account by the class of invalids who hope to profit by its salutary influences.

For example, it appears certain that diversions which are intended to refresh minds already fatigued should not themselves be wearying, and it may well be questioned whether the sights of Italy satisfy this condition. It may be a comparatively easy matter for vigorous minds to content themselves with a sufficiency of interesting objects, even when there remains a large number close at hand still unexplored. But to many nervous persons this kind of self-denial is far from easy, and may act in a very injurious manner. A man who finds himself in possession of two or three months for seeing Italy easily gets infected with the prevailing tourist craving to see all. He is constantly goaded by the re-

fection that he may never have another opportunity of visiting places teeming with interest and easily reached ; he becomes confused and distracted by the competing claims of city and gallery, ruin and natural scenery, as he hears them set forth by the different people he happens to meet ; and out of this *embarras de richesses* flows new vexation for his irritable spirit. As a kind of amusement particularly liable to this fatiguing effect we may instance the vast picture-galleries of Florence and Rome, Venice and Milan. Few persons would like to admit with Mr. Spurgeon that they found nothing impressive in these collections. Yet, if everybody were exactly honest, we suspect that very many indeed would confess to having received little but a blurred, confused impression from most of their visits to these treasures of art. A person may possess real artistic taste, and yet experience the distracting and exhausting effect of trying to gain in the course of a few hours a clear and permanent conception of the best examples of such numerous productions. The very heterogeneity in subject and treatment of these modern galleries greatly adds to the indistinctness of the impression. Any one may see this by comparing with his recollection of one of those large and miscellaneous collections the impression left by such a limited and harmonious series of pictures as that in the monastery of St. Mark at Florence. After visiting this quaint laboratory of devotional effort, one is half inclined to regret the necessity of our spacious galleries with their almost depressing abundance and incongruous juxtapositions. It may seem very heterodox, yet it strikes us that only robust nerves are fitted to derive any considerable pleasure from this sort of sightseeing.

Even if this objection to touring in Italy be deemed frivolous, there are other sources of annoyance which most persons familiar with the country will admit to be real. We need not refer to such obvious little sacrifices as are involved in defective postal arrangements, the difficulty of obtaining one's customary light literature, the curious non-adaptation of Italian dwellings to inclement weather, and so on. We may presume, too, that our over sensitive traveller is not troubled with Mr. Spurgeon's irritable Protestantism, and that he is able to view with tolerable composure the many constant reminders of Catholic faith and priestly ascendancy which he finds there. Assuming simply that he has fine moral instincts and deep sympathies with modern progress, we may be pretty sure that not a few phases of Italian character and life will prove uncongenial, if not irritating. It will be found, for instance, that although many of the common people work very patiently, the particular class with which the tourist has most to do exhibits a preference for indolence which easily appears vicious to our more energetic Northern temperament. So, too, their facility in misrepresentation of fact and invention of fable, practised for the express purpose of obtaining more of the *forestiere's* superfluous money, is a little trying even to minds of a robust type, and can scarcely fail to wound the morbidly sensitive spirit of invalids. It requires some strength of will to suppress the imagination that the whole troop of padroni, ciceroni, cocchieri, &c., are in secret league against the traveller's pocket ; and such an idea, when it gains a certain persistency, can easily neutralize the cheering influence of many days of Italian sun. A lively self-interest, quite apart from disinterested sentiment, is sufficient to render the sight of these unsocial practices exceedingly depressing. The higher order of feelings, again, are apt to be wounded by the display of such offensive qualities as cruelty to animals. One may encounter elsewhere striking instances of indifference to brute suffering. We have seen in the course of a single walk in the streets of Berlin an amount of cruelty to horses that was really sickening. But we would fain believe that no such uniform torturing of draught animals as is to be witnessed in Southern Italy can be found in other countries having any pretence to the rank of civilized nations. Other moral attributes which disclose themselves to the more reflective observer are scarcely less painful to notice. For example, the prevailing want of a spirit of self-dependence and honourable pride in the lower classes cannot but pain a mind trained to regard these qualities as among the most valuable social virtues. It may perhaps flatter the unthinking vanity of some persons to have groups of abject poor cringing and fawning for the chance of a few soldi, but we imagine that to most tourists this interested servility can only prove offensive. In any case it would seem that the frequent experience of these hollow decessions must either debase or afflict the mind of the recipient. How often the former of these effects results will be estimated by those who are familiar with habitual travellers.

It may easily appear to those unacquainted with Italy that its disagreeable features are here unduly emphasized. And some apparent ground for this supposition may be found in the comparative silence of tourists on these points. The causes of the common unwillingness of people to dwell on these unamiable sides of Italian travel are not perhaps difficult to find. Most persons are apt to forget the drawbacks that accompanied a rare and delightful experience, even though at the time they were felt with considerable force. And it must be added that the Italians themselves are eminently qualified to allay one's irritation at some of their egregious faults. More particularly the artistic feelings of the traveller are very apt to go over to the side of the enemy in opposition to his moral sentiments. The many charms of costume, action, and light-hearted speech that invest this race seem to predispose the observer to regard them as Nature's spoiled pets, whom it would be harsh to condemn on strict Northern principles. However convinced the wary traveller may be that behind all the fascination of lustrous eye and graceful

gesture, and the many honeyed devotions of speech, there is lurking a very decided plan of impoverishing him to the utmost, he finds it hard not to be entertained by the spectacle, at least in retrospect.

Yet, allowing the full force of these palliative considerations, we must still look on the evil as a very considerable deduction from the hygienic value of touring in Italy. To a person afflicted with a morbid degree of irascibility the frequent encountering of these anti-social dispositions, however prettily masked, is certain to be tormenting ; and, as a matter of fact, we are inclined to believe that the process of recovering nervous tone has frequently been retarded by the sources of irritation we have been describing. If this be so, it appears worth while to have called attention to them. The ample recognition of them need not of course drive us to the conclusion that a sojourn in Italy is undesirable for the nervous patient. There can be little doubt but that, if he possesses sufficient width of sympathy, the abundance of beneficial diversion will more than counteract the effect of these disagreeable experiences. It may, however, be seriously questioned whether on the whole Italy offers as much salutary recreation as some other pleasant regions of travel which exhibit a more worthy type of society. And, finally, even if this were established, it might still be desirable for persons anticipating benefit from this means to be fully alive beforehand to the existence of its unfavourable concomitants.

MARRIAGE IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

"**W**HAT a sad waste of paper!" was the observation made by a practical man on seeing Mr. Edward Arber's large-paper edition of the *Paston Letters*. By the bibliomaniac, however, who revels in clear print and wide margin this volume will be amply appreciated ; and when the two subsequent volumes shall have appeared, Mr. Arber will have made a most important addition to the labour of love which he is pursuing in his annotated reprints of early English literature. The history of the Paston family, even if it were not an authentic record, deserves to be far better known than we suspect it is. Whatever may have been the social position of his ancestors in Norfolk, William Paston must be looked upon as the virtual founder of the family. Brought up to the law, he was made a serjeant in 1421, and eight years later a judge in the Common Pleas. He added largely to his territorial possessions by the purchase of the manor of Oxnead, which continued for many generations the seat of his descendants, until the death of the last representative of his race, William, second Earl of Yarmouth, who married a natural daughter of Charles II. From Thomas Chaucer, a son of the poet, he bought the manor of Gresham, destined to prove a fertile source of litigation and violence to his successors. The judge increased his fortunes by marrying the daughter and heiress of Sir Edmund Berry, the Agnes Paston of whose letters there are a considerable number. Nothing shows the capacity of the judge more than that he was able to manage his wife. She appears to have been the most energetic of women, admirably fitted to look after a property in the absence of the owner, as sharp as an attorney, and a model of propriety. No indiscretions were tolerated in her household, and her son Edmund is forced to put a certain Gregory out of his service on account of his undue familiarity with a lady in the neighbourhood. Her weak point seems to have been a love of talking, and one of her sons writes to his brother complaining that "she will tell many persons of her counsel this day, and to-morrow she will say by Ged's faste that the same men are false." In addition to her other qualities, she seems to have possessed that of being as match-making a dowager as the present century could produce. We intend to give a sketch of the love affairs of her daughter Elizabeth, whose history may go far to reconcile the spinsters of to-day to their fate and to the times in which they live.

Before the judge's death, about the year 1440, his eldest son John, also bred to the law, had married Margaret Mautby, who had received a present of a gown and a goodly fur upon the occasion. Her letters form a great portion of the family correspondence, written mostly from Norfolk to her husband in London. A country house in 1449 was anything but a safe abode, and it is difficult to understand the change from a defensive to an ornamental character which was taking place in the domestic architecture of that century. Reference is continually made to outrages and scenes of violence. Margaret writes to her husband praying him to get some cross-bows and bolts, as their house is so low that a long-bow could not be used, however great the need might be. Two or three short pole-axes, she suggests, should be kept within doors, as their enemies had made bars to bar the door crosswise, and wickets at every quarter of the house to shoot out at, both with bows and hand-guns, and five holes to fire through knee-high from the floor. The use of these warlike instruments was apparent enough, as in the following year, during the absence of her husband, Lord Moleyns attacked Margaret in her manor-house at Gresham, sending there "a riotous people arrayed in manner of war." They came with bows, arrows, shields, guns, and pikes with fire, broke down the gates and doors with long trees, mined down the wall of the chamber in which Margaret was, broke up all the coffers, and stole stuffs of the value of 200*l.* Breaking of heads and wounding with daggers were everyday occurrences. Agnes

Paston had the greatest difficulty in maintaining her rights; at one time she is building a wall and stopping up the King's way, at another abusing her opponents, at another writing in all directions for a husband for her daughter Elizabeth, whose position at home cannot have been a very pleasant one. "She was never in so great sorrow as she is now," writes a cousin about the year 1449, "for she may not speak with no man who ever comes, nor with servants of her mother; but that she beareth her a hand otherwise than she meaneth. Since Easter she has been beaten once in the week or twice, and sometimes twice on one day, and her head broken in two or three places." Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the chance of escaping from this virago of a mother, and marrying Stephen Scrope, was looked upon as pleasant. Yet Elizabeth shows that she is her mother's daughter in her anxiety about the state of his fortune, and the proviso, "if it so be that his land stand clear," is not omitted. This Scrope was a son of Sir John Fastolf's wife by a former husband, and the impression about him seems to have been that he ought to be encouraged, "without a better could be got," in which case he must disappear. This is expressed in the plainest language:—"Cousin, it is told me there is a goodly man in your inn whose father has just died, and if you think he were better for her than Scrope, it would be laboured, and give Scrope a goodly answer that he be not put off till ye be sure of a better." The writer ends her letter with the strictest injunctions to John Paston to burn it, which her correspondent seems to have regarded as most people do similar requests. The projected marriage with Scrope came, however, to an end, and plaintive cries of "forget not your sister," are heard at intervals from Agnes to her son. On the 30th of January, 1453, Margaret writes to her husband with regard to another match:—"My mother prays you to remember my sister, and do your part faithfully before you come home to get her a good marriage. It seems by my mother's language that she would never so fair be delivered of her as she would now. It was reported here that Knyvet the heir was to marry; his wife and child are dead. Therefore she wishes you to inquire whether it be so or no, and what his livelihood is, and if you think it would do to let him be spoken with thereof." But Knyvet the heir was not destined to be Elizabeth's husband, and was no doubt sold to somebody else. In spite of this discomfiture, John Paston does not remain idle, and labours for Sir William Oldhall to have his sister. Elizabeth, not unnaturally, is getting weary as each arrangement is broken off, and desires to have a full conclusion, while her mother gives her qualified approbation as usual—"If ye can think that his land stands clear, I hold me well content."

The next suitor who appears upon the scene is John Clopton, who in the beginning of 1454 enters into the matter in real earnest. He promises that Agnes Paston shall not be charged with her daughter's board after the day of marriage, which must have won for him the love of that economical housewife, and he assures his future brother-in-law that he has laboured to fulfil his wishes with regard to the jointure. The marriage articles provide for the payment by Agnes Paston of the sum of four hundred marks dower, and the settlement of an estate of 40*l.* a year upon the heirs male of the wedding. The reader of the *Paston Letters* feels that a weight is taken off his mind when he finds that Elizabeth has at last succeeded in getting a husband, and it is with dismay that he discovers from a letter of Lord Grey of Hastings, on the succeeding 11th of July, that this match has shared the fate of its predecessors. Lord Grey writes to John Paston to say that, if Elizabeth is not married, he trusts to God he knows where she may be to a gentleman of three hundred marks of livelihood, who is a great gentleman born and of good blood. John Paston is delighted at such an opportunity, and writes back on the 15th of the same month a most humble letter of thanks. As for his sister she is forsooth neither married nor insured to no man. He adds, without fear of contradiction, that there has been and is divers times and late communication of such marriages with divers gentlemen not determined as yet, and whether the gentleman his lordship meaneth of be one of them or no he doubts. Nevertheless he will take it upon himself that she shall neither be married nor insured to no creature until the Feast of the Assumption, during which interval he would like to know the gentleman's name, the place and country where he lives, and whether he has any children. John Paston concludes by assuring Lord Grey that it would be great joy to him that his poor sister (a most fitting epithet for Elizabeth) should be married according to her poor degree by Lord Grey's advise, trusting then that he would be her good lord. This letter may explain the rupture of the relations with John Clopton, to whom my Lord's nominee would certainly have been preferable. But poor Elizabeth was still to remain unmarried, for Harry Grey, the ward in question, would have nothing to do with her, and on the 6th of September the probability of Stephen Scrope's coming forward again is discussed. "Many would it should not prove, for they say it is an unlikely marriage. In case Cressener be talked of any more, he is counted a gentlemanly man, and a worshipful. At the reverence of God, draw to some conclusion. It is time."

It certainly was time. Scrope, Knyvet the heir, Sir William Oldhall, John Clopton, Harry Grey, Cressener, and no doubt many others, had for five years excited false hopes in the mother's breast of satisfactorily disposing of her daughter. We can only hope that the practice of giving marriage presents was not yet introduced, for had it been, Elizabeth must have spent half her

days in returning them. Her mother's temper, not a good one, as we have seen, at any time, is not improved by the disappointments she has to undergo. In some memoranda of the 28th of January, 1453, we have her educational views. If her son Clement will not behave himself properly, and do his duty in learning, she prays his tutor to "belassch" him, for his last master, the last he ever had, did so at Cambridge. If the belassching succeeds, his tutor is to have ten marks reward. Afterwards mention is made of Elizabeth, who appears to have left her mother's house to stay with Lady Pole; 2*l.* 8*d.* are to be paid for her board, and she is recommended to work readily as other gentlewomen have done, and "somewhat to help herself with." This boarding out was, as is well known, one of the features of the age. Sir John Hevenyngham begs Margaret Paston to take care of a cousin of his, saying at the same time that he has laboured for her in other places, and that he will content her for her board. Frequent beatings and incompatibility of temper had no doubt induced Elizabeth's departure from home. The cost of communication with her suitors may perhaps have obliged her brother to economize, as among John Paston's accounts is an item of 1*l.* 8*s.* paid to William Wyrcester, "equitanti super negotio maritagi sororis." Some two hundred years later, in October 1667, we find Mr. Pepys in very much the same trouble about his sister Paulina. On the 10th of that month he was walking up and down the garden with his father, discussing the chance of a husband for his sister, "whereof there is at present no appearance; but we must endeavour to find her one now, for she grows old and ugly." The following year this exemplary brother succeeded in getting a Mr. Jackson for the purpose, whom he describes as a plain young man, handsome enough for her, one of no education nor discourse, but of few words.

Absence from her mother seems to have produced the desired result, and some time during the year 1458 Elizabeth Paston became the wife of Robert Poynings, who had acted as sword-bearer to Jack Cade during the insurrection of 1450. The bride writes to her mother a most affectionate letter on the 3rd of January following, in which she speaks of her husband as her best beloved, an epithet which has especial force when the large range of her acquaintances is considered. "He is full kynde to her," and, what Agnes Paston no doubt considered of far greater importance in the character of her son-in-law than any such sentimental nonsense, "he is as busy as he can be to make her sure of her jointure." Elizabeth had other reasons for writing, as she begs her mother that her best beloved fail not of the hundred marks which had been promised to him on his marriage, and that Lady Pole, with whom she sojourned, might be paid all the costs done to her before her marriage. After this we hear no more of Elizabeth until the 12th of October, 1460, when she was expecting her confinement. "God send her good deliverance," is the wish of the writer, a sentiment which may fitly conclude this notice of her, and excuse us from entering upon the subject of her second marriage.

ULTRAMONTANE CRITICISM.

THE current number of the *Dublin Review*, the leading organ of English Ultramontanism, contains an article on "the Vatican Council, its Authority and Work," which is—though not perhaps to the ordinary readers of that periodical—quite a curiosity in its way. It is mainly occupied with an elaborate criticism of the *Letters of Quirinus*, reviewed in our own columns two years ago, followed by a shorter notice of Döllinger's *Lectures on Reunion*, to which we called attention last week. What makes the paper all the more instructive as a specimen of Ultramontane criticism is that the reviewer begins by insisting that he "has read *Quirinus* from cover to cover," and that "carefully;" so that he excludes in *linine* the suspicion or excuse of having ignorantly misrepresented an author whom he describes as "one of the greatest liars that ever lived"—"greater," it is added, "even than Macaulay's Barère"—and whom he labours in a note to identify with a very distinguished member of the Roman Catholic peerage. The article must therefore be taken as expressing the deliberate judgment of the *Dublin Review* as to the proper method of dealing with works of which it disapproves; and—putting aside the style, which is unpleasantly redolent of the fish-market—it is difficult to say whether its moral or intellectual peculiarities are the more remarkable. Ultramontane journalists are so fond of bringing wholesale charges of ignorance, stupidity, and dishonesty against writers whose opinions they dislike, especially if they happen to belong to the same communion with themselves, that it may be worth while for once to test the honesty and intelligence of their own criticism on a coreligionist who has dared to be candid in the statement of inconvenient facts. Such at least is the testimony of Bishop Strossmayer, whose alleged recantation, which reappears every six months or so in the Ultramontane journals, has, we may observe in passing, again been authoritatively contradicted. In a letter to Dr. Döllinger, quoted by permission in the *Guardian* of July 19, 1871, he says; "I have looked again through the *Letters of Quirinus*, and I repeat that they are the truest compendium which I have seen of the proceedings of the Vatican Council." We too read *Quirinus* "from cover to cover" at the time of its appearance, but we were inclined at first to think that our memory must have become rather hazy. It seemed scarcely conceivable that a critic just fresh from the study of the work could have fallen into such strange aberrations as these comments appeared to us to betray. We have therefore

refreshed our memory, and the result has been only to increase our amazement. Our readers shall judge for themselves. It is impossible of course to follow the reviewer through every detail of his elaborate indictment; but we will take the more important points in order as they occur. With purely theological questions we do not meddle here, and we shall therefore pass over the opening attack on Quirinus as half a Protestant and a Jansenist to the backbone, "with all that is worst and most odious in the worst and most odious form of that Protean heresy," with one remark. It strikingly illustrates the truth of an observation of the *Times* upon which the writer had just expended three pages of fierce denunciation as "a monstrous lie" (he is a considerable adept at abusing the plaintiff's counsel), to the effect that the Vatican Council has revealed to the public gaze the internal divisions which rend asunder the unity of the Roman Catholic system. Further evidence of the same fact, as will appear presently, is supplied in the course of the article. Nor shall we stay to discuss a passing reference to the first four Ecumenical Councils as having been presided over by the Pope or his representatives, which is notoriously untrue of all except the fourth; or make any comment on the startling assertion that no single authentic fact is produced by Quirinus which throws any doubt on the entire freedom of the Vatican Council. Many of our readers are familiar with the book, and many more will have learnt something of its contents from our columns. They can form their own opinion.

Passing over then the preliminary criticism on the *Letters* as "breathing the spirit of heresy from beginning to end, and reeking with its noisome odour," we come to the first definite charge. No reader of *Quirinus* is likely to forget his account, which indeed found its way at the time into several newspapers, of the Pope's outrageous treatment of the Chaldean Patriarch. It was derived, we believe, from the Patriarch's own lips, and, although he was terrified into submission for the moment, he has, since returning to his diocese, broken off communion with Rome altogether. We can well understand the irritation of the *Dublin* Reviewer at so ugly a disclosure, but it would have been wiser to pass it over in silence if he had no better refutation to offer than the following characteristic tirade:—"What an unruly, mischievous lad the Pope must have been in his schoolboy days; what a terrible fellow as a grown-up, bearded man [we were not aware that Italian priests wore beards], how peppery and pugnacious when now in his extreme old age, with the awful weight of Sovereign Pontiff pressing on his shoulders," he behaves in the manner ascribed to him. And then follows a long and slightly irrelevant story about a dishonest tradesman who cheated his customers, but was too pious to pay his debts on Sunday. Therefore "Quirinus is one of the greatest liars that ever lived." Q. E. D. The next offence charged against the unfortunate historian of the Council is his stating it to be well known in Rome that, small as are the intellectual qualifications required there of candidates for orders, "it was only out of special regard for his family that Giovanni Maria Mastai could get ordained priest." Considering how such matters are arranged in Southern Italy, and that the Pope, who is of noble family, passed from the army into the Church, there is nothing in the least improbable in the statement. It was of course quite open to the reviewer to bring forward any contrary evidence which he was in a position to supply; instead of which he devotes a page to drawing out in his own peculiar fashion all the alleged fact, "affirms" and "implies," and then observes, "It is surely needless to add a single word of comment." Quite so, but might it not have saved needless time and trouble to omit the whole page of comment which precedes the remark? The reviewer goes on to overhaul various passages referring to Archbishop Manning, which make him very angry; but there again all he has to say by way of reply is that a Cardinal's hat would be a less honour to that prelate than the "continuous, scurrilous, and even blasphemous invective" of Quirinus, which simply consists in uncontradicted statements of matters of fact. Be it so, but why not in that case leave the Archbishop in undisturbed possession of so flattering a distinction? The next comment we need notice affords a curious illustration of the temper of the reviewer. He is exceedingly wroth with Quirinus for the praise bestowed on the late Archbishop Darboy, for whom he can himself find no better description—though possibly from a lingering sense of shame he refrains from mentioning his name—than "a person who had given proof of an amount, not only of gross ignorance, but of erroneous doctrine such as we believe no other Bishop of the Church has exhibited since the Synod of Pistoia"—"the author of a condemned work." Considering the moral and intellectual qualities of the murdered prelate, and his noble bearing alike at the Vatican Council, in the dungeons of the Parisian Commune, and in the hands of his brutal executioners, we may reply in the reviewer's favourite formula, "Surely comment is needless." It is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous, and it is amusing, just after this generous and appreciative estimate of one of the most distinguished ornaments of the Roman hierarchy of our own day, to be gravely assured that "the Bishop who displayed the most profound theological knowledge, united to the highest order of ability, were—the Spanish and Neapolitan." The announcement may sound startling, but there can be no doubt about the matter. For why? "They came from the countries of Suarez and St. Alphonsus Liguori." And does not every one know that Spain and Naples stand at the head of European thought and learning?

We have already said that it is no part of our business to discuss the theological differences of Quirinus and his critic. But

the reference of the former to the Council of Florence gives rise also to a violent attack on what the reviewer terms, with his accustomed urbanity, "the gross dishonesty of the scientific historian," which we read with some surprise. Why a definition of the Council of Florence should not be spoken of as such, because a very similar decree had been passed two centuries before at the Second Council of Lyons, is not very obvious, but let that pass. The special gravamen of the charge against Quirinus is that he speaks of the Council as having "bequeathed painful recollections both to East and West," and as having been rejected by the French Church. As to the first point, it is hard to see how any Roman Catholic at least can speak or think of the ill-omened Synod in any other light, considering the utter and immediate collapse of the much-trumpeted "union," which never indeed had any existence except on paper and for a few brief hours in the Cathedral of Florence. But the reviewer summarily denies it. "Is this true? It is false." And his reasons are, that beyond all question the great majority of the Eastern bishops at the Council continued faithful to Rome, and thus "saved their immortal souls," and that they subscribed the famous canon about the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. As this same canon is never quoted in any Ultramontane text-book, and hardly ever alluded to by any Ultramontane writer without being both mutilated and mistranslated, it might have been wiser not to foist it head and shoulders into the argument. But about the bishops, how stands the fact? The decree of union was subscribed by the vicars of the three Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and by nineteen other Eastern bishops or their proctors, but not till a treaty had been negotiated with the Pope, after a good deal of haggling over the terms, by the Russian Patriarch Isidore, binding His Holiness to supply them with so many galleys and men-at-arms in return for their compliance with his wishes, and to pay their journey money. On their return home, where they found the whole of their clergy and people sternly opposed to them, the bishops confessed that they had yielded to their fear of the Franks, and sold the faith; the Archbishop of Heraclea expressed bitter remorse for having suffered himself to be compelled to this act of base apostasy. The churches where the renegade prelates officiated were deserted, and the new Patriarch of Constantinople, Bessarion, who had been Bishop of Cyzicium at the Council, could not command the attendance even of his own officials without an Imperial order, backed by severe penalties. He had the discretion to return speedily to Rome, where he received a Cardinal's hat, and figured thenceforth on State occasions as the ornamental representative of the Church which had publicly repudiated him. As for the rest of the bishops, "it is beyond all question" that many, if not all, of those who had been induced to sign the decree of union soon afterwards retracted their signatures. And even had it been otherwise, in any writer less grotesquely onesided and fanatical the allusion to their "immortal souls" in connexion with what may accurately enough be called the Florentine swindle would sound like a piece of rather profane jocosity. We need not waste many words on the charge of "falsehood" urged against Quirinus for mentioning the notorious fact that the Council of Florence, closed in 1442, was not received in France, as the only counter-evidence alleged by his critic is the expressed or implied opinion of two French writers in the eighteenth century, and one in the nineteenth, that it ought to be considered Ecumenical.

By this time our readers have probably had almost enough of this candid and courteous reviewer. They will observe that as yet he has scarcely even attempted to disprove any one of the statements on which his reiterated accusations of wholesale mendacity are professedly based. But his closing indictment is framed, by virtue of a skilful manipulation of garbled extracts, to assume the semblance of an argument. He is dealing with the charge of a want of freedom in the Council, though it "requires not now any serious notice, when the lapse of more than two years has displayed to the world such stupendous evidence of the perfect unity of the Church"—more especially, we presume, in Germany and Switzerland. And of all the arguments of Quirinus there is only one, he adds, that would really tell against the freedom of the Council, if his statement of facts were true. The particular fact in question, which is not mentioned so much to disprove the freedom of the bishops as to expose the insulting arrogance of summoning them to ratify a foregone conclusion, is this—that the original *Schemata* of the decrees to be laid before them were prepared beforehand by a secret Committee, and in the case of the first constitution, *de Fide*, turned out to be a simple transcript of the lecture notes of a Jesuit Professor at the Collegio Romano. The reviewer does not venture to deny this; indeed he implicitly admits it, but he insists at great length that the two constitutions, as actually passed, differ widely both in form and substance from the original drafts. And thereupon he winds up with the flattering verdict, already cited, that "Quirinus is one of the greatest liars that ever lived, greater even than Macaulay's Barère." Will it be believed that he has arrived at this conclusion by deliberately transferring to the decrees as finally passed what Quirinus says of the original drafts submitted to the Council, and carefully omitting to state that the fact and extent of the subsequent changes is as explicitly pointed out in the work he is engaged in traducing as his own comments upon it? As regards the first constitution, Quirinus says that "those four chapters, having been subjected to the pruning and toning down of the Opposition, bear little resemblance to

the original draft of the Jesuits, and the minority may lay claim to a victory." As regards the second, he says that the Jesuit Franzelin received orders to revise it, and that it was reproduced in a completely altered form. In other words, he says exactly what this veracious critic, who has "read the book carefully from cover to cover," calls him "one of the greatest liars that ever lived" for denying. Such language is happily not usually met with in polite literature at the present day, and we certainly have no intention of copying it.

Our readers will hardly care, after this specimen of his moral qualifications, to follow the reviewer through his comments on Dr. Döllinger's Lectures. But, as they have already seen what he considers a decent and appropriate epitaph for the martyred Archbishop of Paris, they may perhaps be interested to know that his treatment of the sole living theologian of his Church, with one exception, who enjoys European celebrity and respect is quite of a piece with it. Dr. Döllinger's followers are "a miserable rag-fair of apostates," and "this old man" is himself "a miserable figure in the threadbare rags of a decayed Tractarianism." And, finally, warming with his subject into that exquisite vein of refined irony which is so charming a distinction of Ultramontane journalism, this gracious critic dismisses the venerable and venerated Professor as "a German Chollop." And now, to adopt his own phraseology, "we think we have quoted quite enough." One parting caution, which might have been useful to Mr. Lowe if it had been given a week earlier, is all that need be added here. There are not probably many of our readers who are in the habit of studying the controversial articles of the *Dublin Review*. But if any such there be, they will do well to remember that no single statement contained there can safely be taken on trust, and no sort of weight can be attached to any quotation till both the passage itself and the surrounding context have been minutely verified.

HABITUAL DRUNKARDS.

ONE set of fanatics desires to shut up drink-shops, while another set insists that the frequenters of them ought to be placed under restraint. The Permissive Bill and the Habitual Drunkards Bill are equally unlikely to be passed, either by the present or any future Parliament, and we may contemplate both these proposals with curiosity unmixed with alarm. It is indeed wonderful that persons sufficiently sane to obtain seats in the House of Commons should gravely urge that the tendency of working-men to spend their increased wages in drink ought to be counteracted by imprisonment. The existing laws against drunkenness are in the opinion of these persons inadequate, and require to be made more simple, uniform, and stringent. They would desire to legislate in the spirit of the Act of King James I., which imposed the penalty (at that time serious) of 5s., with the alternative of six hours in the stocks. They propose to raise the penalty, and to enact that after three convictions within twelve months magistrates should have power to sentence the offender to a considerable period of detention in an "industrial reformatory for inebriates." The expense of providing such reformatories would alone be a sufficient objection to this plan. There are many thousands of artisans and labourers in England to whom occasional drunkenness is the only form of conceivable enjoyment. Some of the best seamen that go afloat hold the notion that it is not wrong to be drunk on shore. It would be very easy to collect from either of these classes numerous subjects for the application of the proposed law. There are trades in which the practice is to work hard for five days of the week and to drink hard for the remaining two days. In a town where such a habit prevails a reformatory might be filled at one sweep of the legal net. The difficulty would be to find sober men to do the work of the drunkards who were undergoing the process of reformation. In the event, however, of a severe law against habitual drunkards being passed, the police, if left to themselves, would be likely to mitigate it in practice, in order to escape a responsibility which would be intolerable. The Chief Constable of Leeds stated to a Committee of the House of Commons the view of this question which is taken by many holders of similar positions. The man who gets drunk on Saturday night, and yet goes to his work sober on Monday morning, and does his work properly and fairly, is not in this view an "habitual drunkard," although he habitually gets drunk, and he ought not to be interfered with. The discreet officer of police would not interfere with a man who, coming into town on a market-day sober, went away tipsy. He would consider that at any rate the man went away, and could trouble him no more that night, and herein he would resemble another discreet officer of police who, having allowed a thief to escape, thanked God that he was rid of a knave. If persons under the influence of drink go quietly home to bed, the police, unless stirred up by fanatics, would be unwilling to interfere with them. But if the Bill now before Parliament should pass, and if the law thus made should be administered in the spirit of its authors, the police will be compelled to give a great deal of trouble to magistrates and judges as well as to themselves. If drunkenness is to be considered as a crime against a man's own self or his family, it may deserve punishment irrespectively of any disturbance of public order. According to the Bill, a person who is three times within six months convicted of any offence of the definition

whereof drunkenness forms part, shall be deemed an "habitual drunkard," and on a further conviction of an offence of the same character may be sent to a "certified industrial hospital," and there detained under treatment for a period of not less than three nor more than twelve months. The Act of last Session, if stringently administered, may produce a plentiful supply of patients for these hospitals, and there may perhaps be a difficulty in supplying hospitals to receive them. But it is highly improbable that the public will undertake such an extensive business as this of reforming drunkards. Indeed, if such a proposal were likely to succeed, we should pray in aid of our argument against it the valuable principle that freedom is better than sobriety. It is remarkable that the first Parliament elected on an enlarged basis of representation has been more occupied than any of its predecessors with proposals for restricting liberty. There can, however, be no doubt that the present Parliament allows much freedom in ventilating crotchetts. Among other objections to this Bill, we do not half believe in the efficacy of the plan proposed by it. Like the Chief Constable of Leeds, we have not a very strong faith in reclaiming drunkards. The picture which he draws of the effect of prosperity on the working classes is melancholy, but it by no means follows that this Bill is the proper method of improvement. "We have had," he says, "three years of very good trade in Leeds, and that has increased the offence of drunkenness." The effect of what is called the Saturday half-holiday is pitifully described by the same authority by saying that a man has now time on Saturday to get drunk twice before he goes to bed. The Head Constable of Liverpool gives similar testimony in the words, "I think that many of the labouring classes abuse the half-holiday very much." He also does not believe in any permanent reclamation of habitual drunkards. He attributes increased drunkenness to high wages, and it also depends very much on the weather. "If it is very hot, people do not stay in their houses; they are then induced to drink, and then to fight, and then comes the conclusion." All this is doubtless very sad; but we hardly expect a Bill to be brought in to compel the working-men of Leeds or Liverpool to remain indoors in hot weather. Almost the only practical check on drunkenness is to close the public-houses at an earlier hour of the night; and it is fair to the authors of the Licensing Act of last Session to admit that in this respect they do appear to have done considerable good. Drinking is so much a matter of habit that it is by no means certain that a man will begin earlier because he knows that he must leave off earlier.

This Bill proposes to confer upon the Court of Chancery power to appoint a guardian of the person of an habitual drunkard. An order may be made in a summary way on summons at Chambers on such application, and evidence, or after such inquiry, as the Court thinks fit. A guardian appointed by such order would have power to request the reception of the ward into a licensed house, and the Court on application of the guardian may appoint a receiver and manager of the income and affairs of the ward. The foreign Governments which we delight to call paternal could hardly desire larger power than would be thus conferred on the Court of Chancery. A man becomes an habitual drunkard by getting drunk and making a noise, or perhaps by only getting drunk, three times in six months. Being an habitual drunkard, a guardian may be appointed of his person, who may shut him up in an asylum, and proceed under the sanction of the Court of Chancery to receive and manage his income and affairs. The judges of that Court would be certain to protest emphatically against any such authority being conferred upon them; and when the proposal is plainly stated its absurdity becomes manifest. It is further proposed that an habitual drunkard should have power to consign himself to an asylum, and when he is once in he could not get out until the appointed time. The advocates of teetotalism ought to admire an invention far superior to their pledge, which any man can take and break. "A patient received into a licensed house on his own application may be lawfully detained during the period specified in such application." It would be easy to induce a person feeling remorse after drunkenness to make such application, and when that person had entered the house he must remain there. It would be extravagant to suppose that any Parliament would pass such a Bill as this. Indeed, if it were passed, a court of law might possibly hold that the authority given by a man to detain his person could not, except by the clearest language of the Legislature, be made even for a time irrevocable. But the proposal does not deserve serious attention. Mr. Dalrymple will some day air his hobby on a Wednesday, and there will be an end. But if this is freedom, we should like to know what is slavery.

In two States of the American Union power is given to detain "inebriates" for treatment, but this power is subject to limitations which are not found in Mr. Dalrymple's Bill. In the State of New York, a justice of the Supreme Court or a county judge has power to commit an "inebriate" to the State Asylum, on production of affidavits by two physicians and two citizens that such inebriate is lost to self-control, unable to attend to business, or dangerous to remain at large. This is very different from giving power to every court of summary jurisdiction to declare a person an "habitual drunkard," and then order him to be detained for treatment. Again, in the State of Pennsylvania, any relative of an habitual drunkard may present his case to the Court of Common Pleas or Quarter Sessions, which appoints a Commissioner to inquire with a jury into the case. Evidence may then be given to show that the man is an habitual drunkard, and incompetent to attend to his own affairs, and if the evidence is

satisfactory, a Committee of the man's person and estate may be appointed. The Committee has full power to take the inebriate and put him in an asylum. There is also power to the officers of the Institution at Media to receive an inebriate for treatment on "voluntary presentation," but it is not stated that the inebriate may be detained against his will. It is added that justices have no right to commit to any other institution than the gaol.

In further manifestation of the spirit in which the Bill is framed, it contains clauses intended to discourage the bringing of actions in respect of anything done in pursuance of its provisions. If in such an action judgment passes for the defendant, he shall recover against the plaintiff full costs as between attorney and client. In ordinary actions the successful litigant only recovers costs as between party and party, and usually finds that he has a bill to pay to his attorney for extra costs. It is manifest that the introduction of this clause into the Bill tends to complicate the general law of costs. This is the way in which our legislation constantly tends towards confusion. The author of the Bill cares of course for nothing but his Bill. He gives large powers to magistrates and others, and as far as possible excludes the courts of law from interfering to control them. Happily, however, these courts are ingenious in finding methods to restrain injustice. It begins to appear as if the Court of Queen's Bench would become the sole security for liberty against the encroachments of a liberalized Parliament. Can it be on this account that some leading Liberals perseveringly oppose any measure tending to promote the efficiency of the Superior Courts? In discussion of various projects of so-called law reform, it is often assumed that these courts exist only for the carrying on of litigation between private parties. But the Court of Queen's Bench controls all magistrates and officers of the Crown, and the course of modern legislation tends to make such a court more than ever necessary. Happily the judges of that court have both the power and the will to keep a check upon foolish legislation.

THE HAPPY LAND.

THE Court Theatre has now attained a success which it has long deserved. Everybody in London will go to see the *Happy Land*, and although caricature and personal allusions are forbidden, the audience will mentally supply what is wanting of the original representation. It is perhaps trifling to consider the fortunes of a theatre when the welfare of a nation is in suspense, but the remark is obvious that the resignation by Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues of their offices will be likely to interfere with the popularity of this burlesque. When the three mortals return from fairy land to earth, and a fairy who watches their homeward progress with a telescope announces that they are getting into a four-wheeler, and the tall one is bargaining with the cabman to take them to Westminster for a shilling, everybody understands the allusion to the official parsimony of Mr. Lowe. But a successor to Mr. Lowe must come from the other side of the House of Commons, where it must be owned that thriftiness of public money is not the most conspicuous virtue. Again, when the fairy who has undertaken the duties of chief lord of an unnamed department announces that she has spoiled a ship for the sake of a hæmorrhoid, and the tall gentleman observes that a farthing's-worth of tar would have sufficed, the allusion must lose its point on Mr. Goschen's making way for a successor. Some of the economies of Mr. Gladstone's Government have been unwise, and almost all have been unpopular, but it will be difficult to appreciate the most clever ridicule of his Administration after it has been dead and buried for three months. The manager of the Court Theatre has therefore a strong interest in the political crisis of the present week. The prosperity of that theatre would have been best promoted by a prolongation amid difficulties and humiliations of Mr. Gladstone's Government. "Here a kick, there a kick, everywhere a kick"; but you cannot kick effectively unless there is something to be kicked. The right of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues as patentees of the great invention of international arbitration will survive their loss of office, but their successors must be taken from a party which, with all its faults, may claim to have been heretofore consistently regardful of the country's honour, and to be unlikely to listen to impertinent proposals even from more powerful potentates than the King of Bonny. After the first few performances of this burlesque, the spectators only saw three actors who had represented existing Cabinet Ministers. But when they only see three actors who have represented gentlemen who have been Cabinet Ministers, it may be feared that the interest of the spectacle will gradually subside. In the meantime, however, it is gratifying to observe that these actors are able to ensure the success not only of the *Happy Land*, but probably also of any piece that could be placed upon the boards of the Court Theatre. A sufficiently dreary representation of the difficulties of a provincial theatre becomes lively by the simple fact that the part of the manager is undertaken by the tall gentleman of the famous trio. The character of Major Oakley in the *Jealous Wife* affords small scope for the display of comic talent, but the audience seem to find amusement in the knowledge that the stiff military stock will be exchanged presently for a scarf of resplendent green. If indeed Mr. Lowe could remain Chancellor of the Exchequer, the umbrella of the tall gentleman would become almost as famous as that of Paul Pry, and the Highland fling might be repeated

nightly until the recess of Parliament offered a fresh opportunity for addressing Scotch audiences upon current politics. But one soon grows weary of flogging a dead horse, and there is little flavour in allusions to the snubbing of a Government which has resigned office in deference to an adverse vote of the House of Commons.

The original performance of this burlesque was very good fun while it lasted, which unfortunately, but necessarily, could be only for a very few days. Political partisans who agree in nothing else must be almost unanimous in approving, although regretting, the action of the Lord Chamberlain under the circumstances. "It's naughty, but it's nice," must have been the verdict of the audience of the first four nights. Unless the censor had interfered in such a case, it would be difficult to perceive the utility of maintaining any censorship at all. A London manager has seasonably reminded his brethren that it is better to continue subject to the Lord Chamberlain than to be handed over to the magistrates, whose decisions in granting or refusing licences would be liable to fluctuate from year to year, according to the views of morals and religion which might happen to prevail upon the Bench. There are many worthy persons upon the magisterial bench who would desire to proceed against stage-players in the spirit of the statute of Queen Anne which was passed "for the more effectual punishing of rogues, vagabonds, sturdy beggars, and vagrants, and for sending them whither they ought to be sent." This statute was by a later statute made applicable to persons who should act plays for reward without licence from the Lord Chamberlain. Such persons were liable as rogues and vagabonds to be publicly whipped or sent to the House of Correction, and they might also incur further penalties, including frequent whipping, as "incorrigible rogues," or might be sent to be employed in the King's service either by sea or land. The effect of these statutes was, that no person could perform at all without patent or licence, nor with it, unless within the prescribed limits, which were the city and liberties of Westminster and the actual residence of the Sovereign. It subsequently happened that many great towns were desirous of having theatrical entertainments, and Acts of Parliament were passed enabling the Crown to authorise them. Afterwards a general Act was passed enabling magistrates to grant licences in places beyond the limits of the authority of the Lord Chamberlain. This was the state of the law during the period extending from 1783 to 1843, which is almost exactly identical with that to which we now look back as the most flourishing period of the history of the English stage. By the Act of the present reign which now regulates theatres, the performance of unlicensed plays incurs a penalty of £50. nightly, but the performers in them are no longer liable to be treated as rogues and vagabonds. This Act authorises the Lord Chamberlain, "whenever he shall be of opinion that it is fitting for the preservation of good manners, decorum, or of the public peace so to do," to forbid the acting of any play; and it was in exercise of this authority that the Lord Chamberlain interdicted the original *Happy Land*. It is well to keep in such matters on the safe side, and as ingenious actors can generally contrive to imply that they are not permitted to express, the audience does not after all lose much of the fun, and is able at the same time to congratulate itself on its own cleverness. In the French theatres under the Empire the difficulty was that audiences would find opportunities for expressing political feeling even where the author did not intend to give any. Even the standard works of the French stage were found to contain passages of inconvenient significance, and we believe that the last scene of *Tartuffe* was curtailed in consequence of chance observation of a spectator, which was heard and applauded by the entire house. It has been urged that if the Premier may be caricatured in *Punch* or *Vanity Fair*, the same thing ought to be allowed upon the stage. But the former process is found compatible with the preservation of the public peace, which is at least likely to be endangered by the latter.

After all, the success of a piece depends not only upon good writing and good acting, but also upon a full and sympathetic house, and this the intervention of the Lord Chamberlain has secured for the Court Theatre. An audience possessed with a common sentiment will be satisfied with the mere pleasure of giving vent to it. This was a great cause of the success of theatres during the long war with France. The news of a victory in the morning would make any play which contained a few patriotic allusions tolerable in the evening. In the early years of this century the nation was united in hostility to a foreign enemy, and the public has lately become almost unanimous in dislike to the measures or the men of Mr. Gladstone's Government. Hence, if that Government could only have remained in office, the Court Theatre might have become the most popular in London. The ridicule of competitive examinations will still be seasonable, but after Mr. Gladstone has chosen between doing nothing, dissolving, and resigning, it is to be feared that three courses will not be open to him for some time to come. The talent for making two and two come to three or five according to circumstances is likely in the present entanglement of politics to be useful to politicians of either side, and it cannot be asserted that this talent belongs exclusively to one side. The notion that representative government must necessarily be applicable to fairy land is characteristic rather of a past age of Liberalism than of the present. Americans apparently believe that a Republic could be made to work in Spain or Turkey or the Moon, but Englishmen have learned to doubt whether the political system which they find existing in their own country

will bear transplanting. It is at least conceivable that the fairies who visited England cared more for the chops and bottled stout, and even for the women of the country, than for its political institutions. But of course the three right honourable gentlemen who visit fairy land might be allowed to believe in the superiority of the English form of government as long as they administer it. We can only regret, from a theatrical point of view, that this condition has become non-existent. When Ministers become private persons, burlesque of their appearance and manner of talking must lose its interest. The manager of the Court Theatre will deserve sympathy in the event of the partial disappointment of a well-imagined and skilfully executed plan. Miss Litton states that she had been induced to believe that "the principle of personal reference to unpopular public characters" had been conceded by the Lord Chamberlain. It was perhaps going too far to assume that Lord Sydney had conceded that his colleagues in office were unpopular. "Here a kick, there a kick, everywhere a kick," may be almost literally true; but a kick at a Prime Minister ought not to come from the Queen's Household.

REVIEWS.

WYVILLE THOMSON'S DEPTHS OF THE SEA.*

IN no department of zoology has there been of late years a greater revolution than in that to which belongs the existence of life at great ocean depths. Not twenty years ago, it may be said, with almost all naturalists as with one not less distinguished than the late Edward Forbes, the belief in a zero of life, or a depth below which no animal existence was possible, was an article of the scientific creed. Under conditions of pressure, of defective light, temperature, and aeration, such as were held to prevail in the abysses of the deep sea, nothing approaching to known varieties of animal life could, it was thought, by possibility exist. Cases, however well authenticated, of animals comparatively high in the scale of life having been brought up by sounding lines from great depths, were set aside even by men of eminent standing in science, as having been due to careless observation, or to the fact of the creatures having got entangled in the line while floating near the surface. It is to the operations involved in laying and subsequently fishing up the Atlantic telegraph cable that the first great impulse towards an opposite belief is to be traced. Solitary or infrequent cases had indeed occurred to stir the thoughts of naturalists. There was the beautiful Medusa's head, fished up by Sir John Ross from one thousand fathoms in Baffin's Bay, lat. $73^{\circ} 37' N.$, September 1, 1818; and there were the rich hauls of corallines, and other varieties of invertebrate life, obtained by Sir J. C. Ross in equally far Southern latitudes and from much the same depths, suggesting to those able explorers, though contrary to the received opinion of naturalists, that the lowest depth to which we might succeed in penetrating would be found to teem with animal life. The minute samples of Atlantic ooze brought up by the sounding apparatus introduced by Mr. Brooke in 1854 made known the existence and diffusion of microscopic forms not distinguishable from the fossil constituents of chalk, which the discovery of identical specimens from the Pacific showed to be in all probability distributed over the whole ocean floor. Doubt still existed whether these organisms had their life at the bottom of the sea, or were precipitated in fine showers after death. The opinion of Ehrenberg in favour of the first of these hypotheses was balanced by that of Professor Baily, of West Point, on the contrary side; Professor Huxley in 1858, in his report upon the problem to the Admiralty, expressing himself guardedly as on the whole inclined to believe that the Globigerinae and other foraminiferae and diatoms really lived at these depths. Dr. Wallich's dredgings in the North Atlantic, though not conclusive of the question, contributed much to strengthen the same belief, which was generally held to be established for good when Mr. Fleeming Jenkin showed the manifold specimens brought up with the submerged cable between Bona and Sardinia from depths extending to 1,200 fathoms, among which Professor Allman readily identified fifteen animal forms, including the ova of a cephalopod. Subsequent examination of organisms derived from the same source enabled M. Milne Edwards to pronounce the problem finally solved. In the spring of 1868, while engaged in Ireland with Dr. Carpenter in working out the structure and development of the crinoids, Mr. Wyville Thomson conceived the idea of urging on the Board of Admiralty the fitting out of a vessel for the express purpose of submarine exploration and research. The influence of the Royal Society having been brought to bear, through the agency of Dr. Carpenter, the *Lightning* steamer was placed at the disposal of those two naturalists during the summer of 1868 for a trial cruise to the North of Scotland; and the *Porcupine*, Captain Calver, R.N., was assigned for a much wider series of surveys, under the same gentlemen, with the addition of Mr. Gwyn Jeffreys, in the summers of 1869 and 1870. At the close of these operations it was thought right that those who had been charged with their scientific direction should, in addition to their official reports, lay before the general public some account of their pro-

ceedings. It should first be shown that the value of the additions thus made to the sum of our knowledge justified the outlay of public money on this object; and next there should be given such a popular outline of the main results of the enterprise as might stimulate general interest, and urge forward the progress of curiosity and research in the boundless field thus opened to the student of animal life.

Had this undertaking come about under the auspices of the French or German Government, we can picture to ourselves the systematic and magnificent series of reports which would have been given to the world; each prominent member of the scientific staff contributing his methodical and exhaustive statement of facts and observations, the whole subjected to strict editorial control, clear in arrangement, rich in illustration, artistic in the style of getting up. Under the economical rule which prevails amongst ourselves, we have to rest content with such slender and grudging aid to science and literature as consists in now and then fitting out a spare gunboat and charging a few thousands upon the Estimates for the bare necessities of the voyage, leaving it to private liberality or the heavily taxed means of our scientific bodies to present the fruits of the enterprise in an available form before the public. It would be hardly fair to complain of the comparative poverty of the guise in which the result of this quasi-official undertaking comes before us, of the slight degree of system or arrangement manifested in its preparation, or of the discursive nature of a large portion of its contents. It is only as a popular reporter, not as an authoritative or specially qualified exponent of the truths of physics, that Professor Wyville Thomson claims to make himself the mouthpiece of the expedition. Having, in common with his colleagues, plenty of other things to do, he could hardly, we suppose, be expected to bestow more time and thought on sifting and organizing his materials. As it is, there are not a few signs of the pressure of that haste in compilation with which there is proverbially the less speed. With a little more leisure at his command, he might have spared himself the trouble of repeating in later portions of the book many facts and considerations with which he had already made his readers familiar in the introduction. Allowing, however, for these drawbacks, there is in his report an abundance of novel and interesting matter for which it behoves us to be grateful.

In the first of these cruises the chiefs of the survey seem to have been feeling their way tentatively, and even timidly; the greatest depth sounded having been 1,500 fathoms, which, by special leave from the hydrographer, they felt emboldened on the second trip in the *Porcupine* to extend to 2,500 fathoms at a spot indicated in the chart 250 miles west of Ushant. It was felt that if the existence of life could be established, and its conditions to a great extent laid down with accuracy, at that depth, the general question might be considered solved for all depths of the ocean. It was of course hardly to be expected that the haul of results from abysses like this should equal in fulness of organization those obtained from lesser depths or in nearer proximity to the land. None of the deeper products of the dredge can well be compared in point of development or beauty with the magnificent *Brisinga coronata*, a new star-fish of the genus first established by M. Sars in 1853, and named by him from a jewel (*Brising*), of the goddess Freya, the engraving of which to the natural size (fig. 5), is conspicuous among the admirable woodcuts of the volume before us for accuracy of drawing and definition of texture. This wonderful creature, with its dozen or so of long spines of unequal length, only one of the longer ones unmitigated, thirty centimetres in length, looks at first sight intermediate between ophiurids and star fishes, the arms too thick and soft for the former, while much more long and delicate than is generally found in the latter group. It was brought up from about five hundred fathoms, the bottom temperature being a little below freezing point, the thermometer at the surface marking $10^{\circ} 5' C.$, amongst a mass of rhizopods, sponges, echinoderms, crustaceans and molluscs. Other species of this splendid asteria have been found by M. Sars, measuring not less than two feet across the extended arms. Among the sponges a finely characteristic specimen, beautifully drawn to half the natural size, is the sea-nest of the Setubal shark-fishers, *Holtenia carpenteri*, an oval or approximate sphere nine or ten inches in height, with one large oscular opening at the top, whence a cylindrical cavity passes down into the substance of the sponge, the outer wall of which consists of a complicated network of the cross-like heads of five-rayed spicules, in aspect resembling many well-known varieties of the cactus. When the sponge is living, Professor Thomson writes, the interstices of this siliceous network are filled up both outside and in with a delicate fenestrated membrane formed of a glairy substance like white of egg, which is constantly extending or contracting the fenestrae and gliding over the surface of the spicules. This sarcode, the living flesh of the sponge, is fed by organic matter carried in a constant current by the action of cilia through apertures in the outer wall, passing out by the large osculum at the top. From the lower third of the sponge a perfect maze of delicate glassy filaments, like fine white hair, spreads out in all directions, penetrating into the fine semi-fluid mud, and supporting the sponge in its precarious bed, while adding but little to its weight. Of more slender form, another elegant species is the *Hyalonema lusitanicum*, previously found off the coast of Portugal by Barboza du Bocage (fig. 66), closely related to the glass rope sponges of Japan, long a puzzle to naturalists; anchoring itself by sending right down through the soft ooze a coiled wisp of strong spicules, each as thick as a knitting-needle, which open out into a

* *The Depths of the Sea: an Account of the General Results of the Dredging Cruises of H.M. S.S. "Porcupine" and "Lightning," during the Summers of 1868, 1869, and 1870.* By C. Wyville Thomson, LL.D., F.G.S. &c. With numerous Illustrations and Maps. London: Macmillan & Co. 1873.

brush as the bed gets firmer, and fix the sponge in its place somewhat on the principle of a screw-pile. The sponges of the deep water ooze are by no means confined to one group. "The *Hexactinellidae* are perhaps the most common, but corticate sponges, even allied to those which look so rigid when fixed to stones in shallow water, send out long anchoring spicules and balance themselves in the soft mud." Such is the case with *Tisiphonia agariciformis*, so named by Professor Wyville Thomson from its resemblance in shape to a familiar kind of fungus. We can picture to ourselves the ocean floor overspread for the greater part of its area with a richly variegated carpet of sponges of innumerable kinds.

After describing at length the interesting operations of deep sea dredging, with a full account of the apparatus and instruments employed, our author gives, in his chapter on Deep Sea Temperatures, a series of facts and carefully drawn-up tables of observations bearing upon the relations between temperature and depth, and the influence of both those conditions upon animal organization and development. Combined with what has been done towards the analysis of sea water from different depths (as detailed in the appendices), imperfect as that branch of inquiry remains as yet, a basis has here been laid for building up a wholly new system of submarine zoology, showing the laws of distribution and development in animal life in correlation with the laws which regulate the physical conditions of the medium in which it exists. It is of importance to trace with Professor Wyville Thomson the differences in size, in development, and in other features of organization that are to be seen between the denizens of warm and cold areas, or greater and lesser depths. To take an instance; among the innumerable echinoderms with which the cold area to the north-west of Shetland abounds, many of them added for the first time to the fauna of the British Isles, were sundry diminutive species which our author considers to be as truly a pony form of echinus, as is the Shetland breed among the varieties of *Equus caballus*. It would be interesting to know for certain what share cold may have had in dwarfing or modifying the growth of echinus within this area, or to what extent it may be related to depth. In comparatively shallow water *Cidaris hystrix* was observed to be most abundant and of large size, while the large form of *Echinus flemingii* was rare; though, on the other hand, a form four times the size of the pony echinus, in no way differing in colouring, sculpture, or form of the pedicellariae, was common in the deep water off the coast of Ireland. Foraminifera, we are told, are not very abundant in the cold area; here and there, however, in isolated patches, large and remarkable forms came up in numbers on the heben tangles attached to the dredge, principally of the *arenaceus* type. Among starfishes, which the deep water yielded in abundance, the most conspicuous were the genera *Astropecten* and *Archaster*, with their allies; the tangles coming up within the cold area scarlet with *Astropecten tenuispinus*, bringing up as well a handsome new form of a peculiar leaden grey colour, with papillæ arranged on the dorsal surface of the disc in the form of a rosette, or the petaloid ambulacra of a *clypeaster*. Within the same area were found many specimens of a fine *archaster* (fig. 17), with a double row of large square marginal plates, giving the edges a thickened square-cut appearance like those of *Ctenodiscus*, each marginal plate covered with miliary grains, and with a prominent rigid central spine. This specimen is some six inches across the disc, and forms one of the most striking additions to our naturalists' tale of known species. Numbers of the handsomest of the Northern free crinoids also came up in the cold area hauls, such as *Antedon eschrichtii*; with many interesting crustaceans, figured by the writer as highly suggestive of the source of the cold water. These are some of the gigantic forms of amphipoda and isopoda of the Arctic Sea, imperfectly represented hitherto from British waters. Among them is a strange kind of skeleton shrimp, *Caprella spinosissima*, which fixes itself by its hind claspers to branching sponges, waving its quaint grotesque body about in the water; and *Arcturus baffini*, which has the same habit of clinging to some foreign body, and possesses an enormous pair of antennæ for the retention of its young. A queer sea-spider, *Nymphon abyssorum*, of large size, frequently comes up clinging to the sounding line. The mollusca yielded by the second cruise were altogether subordinate as regards number and variety to the other groups, nor was the difference between the molluscan fauna of the warm and of the cold area by any means so great. But few fishes were procured, owing, it was thought likely, to the unsuitableness of the dredge for captives of this kind.

From the warmer area, dredged later in the cruise, specimens of extraordinary beauty and interest were obtained. What most gladdened the heart of our naturalists was *Calveria hystrix* (fig. 27), named from the esteemed commander of the *Porcupine*, an echinus of exceptional size and conformation, in colour a rich crimson, which it retained in spirit without much loss, showing the jaw pyramid, "Aristotle's lantern," large and strongly developed. Combined with two other allied specimens *Calveria* is found to throw light upon a puzzling fossil specimen or two from the Kentish chalk, pointing to the survival of a family or tribe otherwise not known in the geological record. In crustacea and mollusca the warm area proved abundantly rich. An attack of fever unfortunately preventing Professor Wyville Thomson from accompanying the *Porcupine* into more Southern latitudes, the charge of operations in the Mediterranean devolved upon Dr. Carpenter, whose results our author only feels called upon to indicate in general terms. Nor

does he deem it possible as yet to give anything like a full and exhaustive account of what has been added by the expedition to our knowledge of natural history. In his chapter on the Deep Sea Fauna, however, he presents us with a valuable though brief outline of the distribution of the animal forms resulting from the dredgings, with reference at once to the conditions of depth and temperature under which they were found to exist. So rich and varied is the material thus acquired that it will take years of the labour of specialists in each of the larger departments to work it up. The sponges are now, we are glad to learn, under the able hands of Mr. Henry Carter; and a general sketch of the sponge fauna of the deep Atlantic has been already put forth by Professor Oscar Schmidt of Gratz, the highest authority upon the subject. To Mr. Gwyn Jeffreys we look for the identification and description of the mollusca. From the conclusions thus far announced by so competent an authority as to the Northern origin of most of the molluscan fauna, and their transportation to the Mediterranean, and even to the Gulf of Mexico, by the great Arctic currents, our author opposes his own view of the retirement of Northern species from the British area, at least at the close of the Glacial period, and the immigration of Southern fauna, supported as it is by numerous proofs drawn from the comparison of living and extinct species. The question of priority of age, as indicated by fossil remains, is, he shows, complicated by the fact that beds which correspond paleontologically in their involved fauna may be proved to be by no means contemporaneous, owing to one of them being found overlaid by strata of newer date while the other is still forming. Moreover, as he urges, the conditions of temperature and light of our Southern seas at great depths correspond very closely with those of much shallower water in the Scandinavian seas. Hence not only have we had an earlier and more thorough knowledge of the Northern species, but they have been met with superior in size and richness of sculpture or ornament, which has been taken to give them a presumptive priority in order and rank. The tendency to dwarfing in deep water has been already referred to. With regard to the evidence of light penetrating the abysses of the ocean, as suggested by the vivid colours and the well-developed eyes of animal forms dredged up from two thousand fathoms and more, the writer throws out the idea that, in the absence of sunbeams, the submarine light may, beyond a certain depth, be due to phosphorescence, which is known to be very general, particularly among the larvæ and young of deep sea animals. This is one of the problems which stand over for further investigation, as do many questions raised in the chapter on the Continuity of the Chalk, in which his conclusions have been challenged to some extent by Sir R. Murchison and Sir C. Lyell. One main difficulty which he confesses to having before him in establishing the identity of the recent Atlantic chalk mud and the ancient white chalk lies in the total absence in the latter of free silica. When speaking, however, of its having been shown by the analysis of our chalk strata that siliceous organisms were entirely wanting in the ancient cretaceous seas, we fail to see that he has taken due account of the flinty masses of which siliceous sponges formed unquestionably the nucleus, and of which he himself proceeds to give typical instances, although in some cases all that remains in the chalk may be the moulds and outlines of organisms from which the whole of the silica has been removed by solution or otherwise.

In his chapter on the Gulf Stream, with reference to the phenomena of Atlantic currents and temperatures in general, while adding immensely to our materials for studying the great problem of ocean circulation, by means of the numerous observations recorded and the valuable tables which embody so much patient labour, our author has strangely limited his view of the primary causes of the great ocean currents. To the theory of Captain Maury, modified to some extent by the later views of Dr. Carpenter, that the motive impulse is due simply to the oscillation of temperature between tropical heat and evaporation on the one hand and arctic cold on the other—"comparable to the circulation of the atmosphere"—he is content to oppose his own hypothesis, which as simply assigns it to the "drift of the trade winds." The first point that strikes us in contrasting the opposite theories advanced by such able men is the total absence of any reference to the rotation of the earth, as well in relation to oceanic as to atmospheric circulation. This strange omission must, as far as we are concerned, place either hypothesis alike outside the pale of discussion. In the next place, were we disposed to treat Professor Wyville Thomson's trade-wind theory on its independent merits, can it appear to him, we would ask, that the mere action of periodical (not perennial) winds on the surface is adequate to set in motion a mass of water six thousand miles long, several thousand miles in width, and in places a mile or two in depth—an effect to which he considers Dr. Carpenter's convection-of-heat theory utterly inadequate? Whatever we may think of the power of the sun's rays to penetrate and to heat the ocean abysses at those great depths, it calls for a stronger effort of the imagination to conceive the ocean mass to be stirred in any degree in its depths by any force of the atmosphere agitating its surface, far less to be set in movement in those rapid currents which are found to extend to the very bed of the deepest waters. How, too, would our author account for the circulation of the other great ocean basins besides the Atlantic? Is he prepared with a theory of the corresponding action of the trade winds in every case? We have here one of the weak points in a work which in most respects is marked throughout by logical com-

mand of facts no less than by patience and skill in accumulating them. The mastery which Professor Wyville Thomson shows over the results arrived at during this comparatively restricted series of explorations augurs well for the harvest of knowledge to be reaped, we may hope, in the course of the more adequately equipped and more extensive survey over which he has now gone forth in supreme control. Wishing God speed to the *Challenger* and the whole of her scientific staff, we look with confidence to her return with a freight of precious fruits, to which the volume before us, choice and ample as it is, will serve but as the prelude and the foretaste.

ANIMALS AND THEIR MASTERS.*

WE are all, it may be presumed, tolerably familiar with the "Friends in Council" whose moralizing has now been public property for many years past. It would be useless to criticize this little volume, which contains a report of their last debates from a general point of view. Everybody knows the amiable good sense, running a little into prolixity, of Milverton, and the amiable sarcasms, in which the amiable predominates a little too clearly over the sarcastic element, of Ellesmere. It is enough to say that they and their friends talk in the old style with no perceptible diminution of freshness and thoughtfulness. We may, however, dwell a little upon the subject-matter of their private debates. They indulge of course in a good many digressions, and repeat various anecdotes not strictly relevant to the main subject; but they resolve to devote themselves chiefly to the topic of the relation between man and his dumb slaves. Milverton, it appears, had lately an escape from drowning. After his deliverance from danger he reflected, characteristically enough, that there was one subject to which he had never yet done justice. He resolved that he would not get into a boat, or travel on a dangerous railway again, before he had "said his say upon the important question of the treatment of animals." If, which we earnestly hope may not happen, Milverton should be crushed by the next train which he enters, or drowned in a rash attempt to see the University boat-race, his last moments may be consoled by the thought that he has spoken a good word for our humble friends, and a word which is certainly much needed.

We are all agreed in theory that kindness to animals is an important duty. In practice we—especially if the pronoun includes pigeon-shooters, cabdrivers, and students of physiology—have a good deal to learn. To take two or three simple instances, mentioned by Milverton; the use of the bearing-rein inflicts a great amount of discomfort upon horses, in obedience to a silly fashion which persists in spite of common sense and in spite of the professed love of horses of the English race. Omnibus horses again, who have not in any way a very cheerful existence, have their mouths wrenched and their limbs strained every few hundred yards because omnibuses are not provided with drags. Sheep and oxen go through an incalculable amount of suffering from thirst and overcrowding because we do not choose to make proper regulations for their comfort in ships and railway trains. The horrors of vivisection are too disgusting to be noticed in detail by Milverton, and we are only too glad to follow his example. It would be easy to add to this a brief list of notorious cruelties which are daily perpetrated, some of which might be at once remedied by legislation, whilst more generally a slight improvement in the general standard of sensibility would be amply sufficient to effect a radical cure. The time at which any expression of compassion for brutes would be treated as ridiculous has fortunately passed, and all we have to do is to impress upon men's minds a duty which is generally recognized. We think, therefore, that Milverton's effort to prove that animals have rights is rather superfluous. No duty is plainer, though many are of more importance. The sufferings of a horse are a less evil than the sufferings of a negro; but then the horse, being unfortunately, as Ellesmere remarks, a dumb animal, is unable to help himself or even to complain of his sufferings, and is therefore so far more entitled than the nobler animal to assistance from above. It need only be added that by enforcing humanity we are not merely diminishing the mass of pain which exists throughout the world, but are putting down a most demoralizing practice. The present volume is certainly calculated to give a keener edge to our sympathies. The kindly feeling which is obvious in every page must of course do good to its readers; and two or three lines of thought are indicated, though they are not completely worked out, which would deserve a fuller investigation.

The Friends, for example, amuse themselves by looking up a variety of authorities upon the subject; and they give us a sufficient number of quotations to make us wish that somebody would write a small systematic essay upon the development of this department of speculation. There is really much to be said about it from a philosophical point of view. Thus it is curious to observe that the great enemies of animals, so far as theory is concerned, are the metaphysicians of the Des Cartes variety. In the religious writings of almost all sects we find the duty of kindness to animals inculcated, and often with surpassing tenderness. The legends of St. Francis of Assisi give the most beautiful expression of this sentiment, and Milverton quotes a pleasant story from Humboldt

to prove that the monks of his order clung to the tenets of their great founder. A Franciscan who accompanied the naturalist on some of his journeys used to say, when a storm was threatening at night, "May heaven grant a quiet night both to us and to the wild beasts of the forest!" But as soon as we turn to the metaphysicians the natural milk of human kindness seems to be dried up under the influence of their abstract theories. Thus, for example, Aquinas says in his *Summa*:—"Animalia bruta non delectantur visibilibus, odoribus et sonis, nisi in ordine ad sustentationem nature"; and we all know the theory of animal machines which was common to Des Cartes and many of his disciples. The reason is doubtless, in a general way, that which Milverton gives us. Philosophers have a foolish prejudice against animals, for fear that they should set up a claim to the possession of a soul, which would interfere with the roundness and neatness of philosophical theory. Reason is the human faculty, and it is necessary to draw the widest and deepest line of demarcation between it and everything which appears to be analogous in the lower animals. A creature which is incapable of forming a syllogism must be regarded as scarcely worthy to be called a living creature at all. We need not add the perplexities which result from the admission or the refusal to admit that animals have free will. And thus reasoners of this class have fallen into gratuitous absurdities which are equally revolting to the natural philosopher and to the religious thinker. The greatest advocates of animal rights in recent times, so far as theory is concerned, have been the philosophers who have most objected to *a priori* methods—such, for example, as Jeremy Bentham, who becomes really eloquent in defence of humanity to brutes, and Mr. John Stuart Mill, who has spoken with equal effect on the same side of the question. We may hope that this part of their theories at any rate will prevail, and that the closer connexion between ourselves and the brute creation which Mr. Darwin seeks to establish will at least lead to a stronger interest in our poor relations. Milverton or one of his friends mentions that he has heard in his time 1,320 sermons, and says that he has not heard in one of them the slightest allusion to the conduct of men towards animals. We commend the subject to the attention of the dignitaries who have been advocating a crusade against drunkenness. Cruelty to animals may not have so widely corrupting an influence as intoxication, but when sermons are preached against one variety of vice, something may fairly be added against the other.

And this brings us to the further question, What practical steps can be taken to enforce this duty upon people in general? The power of legislation, though legislation may do something, is obviously limited. Milverton defends himself against Ellesmere, who had complained of the absence of any suggestion for practical remedies, by remarking that hundreds of thousands of transactions take place every day in London in which the treatment of animals by men is more or less concerned, and that it is out of the question to lay down rules by which they can all be regulated. The great thing to do, he says truly, is to introduce a new spirit. But how, it may be asked again, is that to be done? If it is meant, What device can be suggested which will within any limited period make men humane instead of brutal? the answer is only too plain. No such device can be struck out at a moment's notice, nor, properly speaking, can it be struck out at all. A change in the character of men and nations requires generations rather than years. Something, however, may be effected by judicious action in different directions. Milverton, for example, thinks that a book might be written for schools to inculcate humanity to animals. Such a book would of course require a vast amount of special knowledge; but it might be compiled by "a Huxley, a Wallace, a Frank Buckland, a Hooker, or a Wood, or the Bates who wrote that book upon the Amazons." If this suggestion be taken literally and prosaically, we fear that it would not come to much. No man, not even Professor Huxley or Mr. Frank Buckland, who is perhaps more qualified for this kind of work, can sit down and say, I will write a book which shall wean English schoolboys from cruelty; which shall prevent them from unseasonable birds-nesting, and tormenting cats, and throwing stones at deserted dogs, instead of trying to help them in their sufferings. But the suggestion, if taken up in a judicious spirit, might certainly lead to much. When education means something more than familiarity with the three R's, it may properly include some kind of study of natural history. Nine boys out of ten take some kind of interest in descriptions of animal life; and, though their infantile propensities take the form of teasing rather than protecting their helpless dependents, the childish instinct may easily be turned in the right direction. Both girls and boys have a natural propensity to make pets; a pet creature may be a wretched victim, or it may enjoy a really happy existence; the master or parent who will take the trouble to guide the instinct in the right direction, who will teach the child how much keen pleasure may be derived from attending to the wants and observing the habits of dumb animals, may find the means of giving both a moral and an intellectual education to his pupils. There is an unfortunate confusion in the public mind between the study of natural history and the ruthless destruction of all varieties of beasts, birds, and insects; and yet it is perhaps not too utopian to imagine that a day will come when people will recognize the obvious fact that kindly affections and habits of keen observation can hardly be fostered more easily in early life than by teaching children to take an interest in the creatures by which we are surrounded. Even in any great town there are

* *Some Talk about Animals and their Masters.* By the Author of "Friends in Council." London: Strahan & Co. 1873.

abundant opportunities of stimulating an interest in birds, beasts, and fishes, wild or domesticated, and a child that learns to take advantage of them has the power of enjoying a pure and elevated pleasure, such as he does not always acquire by the power of reading cheap books and newspapers. In short, without endeavouring to follow out a subject of which innumerable applications will suggest themselves to our readers, we may safely say that an intelligent study of natural history would be in every way an excellent mode of cultivating good relations between man and brutes, from which both sides might profit.

We will not touch upon other suggestions briefly noticed in this book, such as the precedent set by Lady Burdett Coutts of giving prizes for the encouragement of humanity to animals. We are content to take leave of the "Friends in Council" with the acknowledgment that their conversations are likely to be of great service in a direction where much is still wanted to be done; and that they have given us some pleasant reading into the bargain.

LANFREY'S NAPOLEON I.*

THERE are certain very obvious defects in M. Lanfrey's History of Napoleon. It is too argumentative, controversial, and didactic. M. Lanfrey does not, like an ordinary historian, tell his story in his own way, and have done with it. He is constantly turning to his audience to point out how much other historians have gone astray, and to ask people to observe what a consummate humbug and impostor the supposed hero really is when you come to look into him. And then he weakens the general force of his argument by tripping up the hero on rather small points. In 1801 Napoleon, being anxious to bend the Spanish Government to his will, threatened, unless his orders were obeyed, to expose an unsavoury scandal connected with the Royal family, and M. Lanfrey expends a great deal of virtuous indignation on this "Borgia trap," this "stab of a stiletto dealt in obscurity at an adversary disarmed." No doubt, in one way, it was a very low, ungentlemanly trick; but, after all, if it was a question between threatening to show up an exceedingly disreputable household and having a great many men killed in war, something might perhaps be said in favour of the milder remedy. Again Napoleon is unfavourably compared with Frederick the Great, and censured for his want of "philosophical irony." "Listen," says M. Lanfrey, "to Frederick explaining the motives which led him to take possession of Siberia: 'Ambition,' he says, 'interest, the desire to be talked of, made me decide on war.' This is grand." And then, by way of contrast, we are asked to observe Napoleon's mock heroics, and affection of noble impulses. Most people will be tempted to think that there is really not much to choose between Frederick's cynicism and Napoleon's hypocrisy. So grave and weighty an indictment as M. Lanfrey is able with indisputable justice to frame against Napoleon is necessarily enfeebled by the introduction of trivial complaints. If a man has been guilty of murder and arson, the jury are more likely to be unsettled than confirmed in their impression of his guilt by a long argument to show that he has been known not to wipe his boots on the mat when visiting at a friend's house. These defects, as we have said, are obvious on the face of the book. It is impossible to deny that it smacks too much of the pleading of the *adversarius diaboli*. In order, however, to do justice to it, it is necessary to remember the circumstances under which it was written. It is true that M. Lanfrey's History is not like the narrative of an ordinary historian, but then his task is very different. He has not only to construct, but to destroy; to destroy, in fact, in order that he may construct. He has to clear the ground of a thick growth of fancy and fable before he can build up the temple of truth. It has become a phrase now to talk of the legend of Napoleon, but few people have any idea of the mass of falsehoods of which the popular history of this man is composed. Napoleon was himself one of the most unscrupulous and industrious liars that ever lived. He was utterly destitute of any sense of honour or truthfulness. He lied from morning to night; he told lies to everybody he met, even to the smallest people, and about everything he had to do with, even the most petty and trivial things. Some persons are restrained from telling lies by the reflection that the people to whom they are told must know the statements to be untrue. But Napoleon was far above this weakness. He would gravely declare that he had never uttered certain words or signed a particular document before people who were quite aware that he knew they had heard him use the words or seen him sign the paper. He destroyed official reports—those of the battle of Marengo, for example—and forged others. His private correspondence, which has been published in our own day, constantly contradicts his official statements, and is also full of falsehoods. His last years were spent at St. Helena in weaving a bewildering web of fable and misrepresentation. Highly imaginative historians have garnished this mass of lies with little fancies and inventions of their own; and hence it is quite as much M. Lanfrey's business to show what Napoleon was not as what he was. M. Lanfrey's History may not be a final and perfect History of Napoleon; but it is at present the only one worth reading, the only one that gives anything like a true account of the real man. Other histories are only myths and legends.

M. Lanfrey's work is addressed especially to his own country-

men, whose illusions on this subject are stronger and more obstinate than those of other people, but it well deserved to be translated. The present volume has an especial interest for Englishmen, for it deals with the hollow Peace of Amiens and the renewal of the war between England and France. This is a very important part of our history, and one as to which English opinion is not so clear and well informed as it might be. M. Thiers, it will be remembered, makes very short work of this passage in the career of his hero. England, he says, made peace because she was exhausted, and then went to war again out of sheer jealousy of Napoleon's glory. The truth is that in 1801 each side had good reasons for desiring a truce, if not a peace. England was suffering from bad harvests, famine prices, heavy taxes, and the uneasiness produced by the King's illness and the Catholic claims. Pitt had made way for Addington. The gladness with which the news of the Peace was received proves the eagerness with which it was desired. "Never, perhaps," says the *Annual Register*, "since the restoration of Charles II. was the general joy in England so high and extravagant." On the other hand, however, Napoleon had equally pressing and urgent motives for wishing a cessation of hostilities. The Consulate was about to blossom into the Empire, and it was necessary that the change should be effected at a moment when everything seemed prosperous and glorious for France. A vast empire stretching to the Alps and the Rhine had already been created. Belgium and North Italy were governed from Paris; Holland, Spain, Portugal, and Switzerland were held in virtual subjection, and French influence was paramount in Germany. There was enough here to dazzle the imagination and to satisfy the national ambition of France, which had never been so powerful even in the days of Louis XIV. Bonaparte had hoped before this to have struck an effectual blow at England, the nation he feared and hated the most, but just then circumstances were hardly propitious. Nelson's victory in the Baltic and the death of Paul I. had broken up the League of Neutrals, on which he reckoned for important naval help. Russia, from being the enemy, had become the ally of England. For the moment it was clearly better for Bonaparte to keep what he had, and get it ratified by treaty, and to settle accounts with England at some more favourable opportunity. It is significant of the spirit in which he acted that the progress of the negotiations did not interrupt his projects of aggrandizement. Before the Peace of Amiens was concluded, he was already carrying out three or four different schemes which could not fail to endanger its stability. He effected the definite confiscation of all those small States such as Holland, Switzerland, the Republic of Genoa, and the Cisalpine Republic, which since the Revolution had fallen under the control of France. The English Ministry naturally refused to ratify these acts of violence and usurpation, but they made no attempt to oppose them. It is evident that Napoleon had taken the measure of the men he had to deal with, and had come to the conclusion that for the sake of peace there was scarcely anything they would not submit to. In this he was mistaken, but when we review the facts we must admit that the mistake was not altogether unnatural. The episode is not perhaps without its lesson for our own day.

During the negotiations Napoleon had repeatedly urged upon the English Government that "libellers"—that is, writers who dared to speak ill of him—should be classed with assassins, and should as such be liable to extradition. It was inevitable that the request should be refused, but unfortunately the refusal was conveyed with a gentleness which was certain to be misunderstood. Even when a demand was subsequently made for the expulsion or punishment of Peltier, Cobbett, and others, "in the name of the law of nations," Addington, instead of at once declaring that anything of the kind was simply impossible and could not for a moment be thought of, was weak enough to instruct Lord Hawkesbury to give a temporizing answer. Napoleon was assured that he was no worse treated by the newspapers than the English Government itself, which always disregarded such attacks; but it was added that the Attorney-General would be consulted as to whether any steps could be taken. As to the refugees, a promise was given that those in Jersey should be sent to England, and it was hinted that possibly Georges and the principal Chouans might be despatched to Canada. Bonaparte's only reply was a formal demand for the suppression of "seditious publications," the expulsion of the refugees in Jersey, the deportation of Georges and his adherents to America, and the banishment of all the princes of the House of Bourbon. These things were asked for under the alleged authority of the law of nations. At the very time when Bonaparte was pressing these insolent demands he had, with the assistance of the infamous Barrère, organized a special press for the purpose of slandering and insulting the English Government, and to these wretched sheets he was himself not above contributing an occasional passage of coarse and brutal invective, or some more than usually audacious falsehood. A familiar phrase occurs in one of the numbers of the *Moniteur* about this time:—"What a difference between a people who make conquests from a love of glory and a nation of shopkeepers turned filibusters!" His next stroke was the definitive union of Piedmont and Elba to France—a defiance which was accompanied by a show of preparations for war. Bonaparte, encouraged by the idea he had formed of Addington's weakness and pusillanimity, imagined that it was necessary only to heap up insults and outrages on the English Government in order to terrify it into submission. On January 3 the official *Moniteur* published Sebastiani's report of his mission to the East, giving an enumeration of the English and

* *The History of Napoleon the First.* By P. Lanfrey. Vol. II. London: Macmillan & Co. 1872.

Turkish forces, and stating by way of conclusion that "six thousand French would suffice to reconquer Egypt." At the same time Bonaparte took a high tone with Lord Whitworth, our Ambassador at Paris. When reminded that he had violated the treaty by his proceedings with regard to Switzerland and Piedmont, he observed disdainfully that these were mere trifles, and that what he had taken he meant to keep. As the English Government did not yet give way, he thought he would try stronger doses of insolent menace. Two days after his interview with Lord Whitworth the *Moniteur* published the annual report on the state of the country. It described England as given over to the squabbles of rival parties, and added that, "while the struggle lasts, there are measures which prudence dictates to the Government of the Republic; five hundred thousand men ought to be, and shall be, ready to defend and to revenge it." This was too much even for Addington, and war was soon after renewed. It would seem that Napoleon had formed an exaggerated estimate of Addington's weakness, and that in any case he had left out of account that the Minister's power depended on the will of the country, and public feeling in England had undergone a serious revulsion since the peace was signed. There had been doubts as to the first war, which though justified by the temper and threats of the Convention, had the appearance of being an attack on the domestic freedom of France. There were no doubts as to the second war, because it was seen to be demanded for the safety, not only of England, but of Europe.

We need not follow M. Lanfrey through the history of the European war, which in this volume is brought down to Jena. We will only say that he underrates, in our opinion, the perils of England at the time of the threatened invasion, when our fleet was put on a false scent, and, but for a combination of rather lucky accidents, things might have gone hardly with us. One of the most interesting chapters is that devoted to the authentic history of the way in which the conspiracy of Georges and Pichegru was nursed by Bonaparte and his police, the entanglement of Moreau, and the murder of the Duke of Enghien. Scattered through the volume there are some curious passages, which we are tempted to bring together, bearing on Napoleon's connexion with journalism and literature. He always spoke with the greatest contempt of men of letters; but this contempt was only an affectation which betrayed, instead of concealing, how much he suffered at their hands. Nothing made him detest England so much as the freedom of the press, which was open alike to natives and to foreigners. His private correspondence shows the importance he attached to getting the writers on his side. So intense was the morbid vanity of the man that, even in the height of his greatness, he would writhe under a sharp sentence from some obscure or unknown journalist, and would even take up the pen himself to answer the attack, or, rather, to overwhelm his critic with the coarsest and most outrageous abuse. In 1803, of the twelve newspapers to which the Consular decree of the year VIII. had reduced the press of Paris, only eight remained, owing to fresh suppressions ordered by Bonaparte. These wretched prints existed only on sufferance. In one day Bonaparte, amidst all his labours, found time to write three letters to the Grand Juge Régnier about the press. In the first he ordered the Grand Juge to reprimand the proprietors of the *Journal des Débats* and of the *Publiciste* for having published news taken from German papers relative to the "pretended armaments"—which were very real armaments—in the ports of Russia. In another he directed an intimation to be sent to the proprietor of the *Citoyen français* that he must change his editor. The third prohibited the newspapers from republishing political news copied from foreign gazettes. "The journalists," he added, "are free to report the news published by the official paper." Fouché having sent him some notes on the powerlessness of Russia, written by one of his agents, Bonaparte directed them to be published "in a newspaper, as translated from an English paper; choose the name of one that is little known." Not content with "inspiring" the press through the Grand Juge and the police, Bonaparte was at times a frequent contributor to the *Moniteur*, the official organ, and in fact the only paper which was read by the people of France. There is the true Napoleonic ring in some of the diatribes against England. The whole nation is accused in one of the articles of having caught the disease of its King. The refusal of Catholic emancipation suggests the remark that "a prince, insane and without faith, had re-established the laws of Nero and Domitian." "Why," the *Moniteur* asks on another occasion, "why are we at war? Because the English people have no one to conduct their affairs but a mad King and a Prime Minister who is like an old nurse." This is exactly the style which Napoleon did not hesitate to introduce even into his public bulletins—such, for example as those in which he pursued the unfortunate Queen of Prussia with vile and malignant calumnies. He described her as the sole author of the war, and attributed her interference to her passion for the Emperor of Russia. "The explanation," he said, "was to be found in the engraving which represented on one side the handsome Emperor of Russia and the Queen close to him, and on the other the King stretching out his hand over the tomb of the Great Frederick. The Queen, dressed in a shawl very much like the engravings of Lady Hamilton in London, is placing her hand on her heart, and appears to be looking at the Emperor of Russia." "The shade of Frederick," adds Napoleon, "must have been indignant at this scandalous scene." And in a succession of bulletins he repeated the cowardly slander. On

the renewal of the war with England the First Consul offered rewards for verses against the enemy, and a "humorous" poem on the Goddams, supposed to be written by a French dog, filled ten columns of the *Moniteur*. An unknown person having written some stanzas without being paid for it, Bonaparte's suspicions were at once aroused, and he immediately wrote to the Grand Juge, "It is advisable to know who is the author of this song; although it appears written with praiseworthy intentions, the police ought not to be unacquainted with any movement." Napoleon, with many great qualities, was certainly on one side of his character one of the meanest and shabbiest creatures in the world; and in a true picture it is necessary that both sides should be shown, though, as we have said, we think M. Lanfrey sometimes makes too much of trifles.

BRIGHT MORNING.*

THERE are enigmas enough in life, confused, contradictory, inexplicable; but the various forms of morality patronized by novelists are among the most puzzling of all. Now we have the ascetic school, where people qualify themselves for canonization by all sorts of works of supererogation and unnecessary self-sacrifice; now the sect which wears its virtues like an old glove, and, for the sake of a passionate will, scatters the most solemn obligations and duties like chaff before the wind. One hero breaks his manly heart and wrecks a useful life through despair at an involuntary crime; another, meant to be accepted as a good fellow in the main, commits acts of baseness and rascality without an effort to disentangle right from wrong. A sweet and sensitive heroine sails perilously near the wind in the matter of certain clauses in the Second Table, but never seems to know that such a thing as remorse exists; while an angel of the back slums preserves a seraphic purity in circumstances wherein it would be impossible to find even ordinary decency. Between these two extremes—the virtue which is so tender that it cannot bear the rude breath of actual life without pain, and the virtue which is so tough that it can go through the mill and come out at the other end as good as new—we are at a loss to understand what is the truth of human nature; and were we to follow the creed of the novelists, we should be lost in a swamp only to land in a jungle.

Bright Morning is a book which, bristling with many commonplace defects, has this peculiar quality of an original morality. It is a story abounding with the vices of the virtuous and the loveableness of the vicious, and no great blame to anyone. Indeed it seems to make very little difference whether the characters are labelled bad or good to start with, for they all fall short of ordinary morality as they go on, and end in a happy confusion of qualities wherein wrong is not so very wrong after all, and right is by no means distressingly rigid. When a young woman, broken-hearted because her handsome scampish lover has jilted her, marries an elderly, worthy sort of man for his money, and fails in every honourable fulfilment of her covenanted duties, the writer shows no sense of blame. Because she loves her boy, and looks pretty while she spends her time in caressing him in the sensual, silly way which novelists delight to depict, and which is profoundly untrue to real life, she is held free to encourage the child to disobey his father, while she herself defies her husband, and holds his reasonable demands as insolent interference. Because she has had a heart blow, she allows herself to cherish years of bad temper and unwomanly hardness; lamenting herself as a sacrifice when she is in point of fact a criminal, and hating her husband as her tyrant when he is all the while her victim. We have seldom met with a more inane and provoking creature than this same Beatrice or Trixie O'Neil. Wayward, passionate, undisciplined, she does not come before us with one recommendation to our regard beyond her beauty. Hence Miss Grant has built up her heroine on the slenderest base on which that odd simulacrum of womanhood can be constructed, and the result is a person whose claims to our sympathy and esteem would be gravely endangered by a fit of indigestion, and totally destroyed by an attack of small-pox or a pimple on her nose. Of depth or dignity she has none; of pure and wholesome affection none; her love for Godfrey Hamilton is due only to the fact of his physical beauty and muscular strength; and his own style of love-making—which, by the way, strikes us as being singularly unlike the love-making of a gentleman to a lady, but more after the pattern of that of a *rowd* to a barmaid, and which is a compound of impertinent familiarity and thinly veiled sensuality—gives the key to the source whence the heroine's passion draws its nourishment and maintains its force.

Nothing is more damaging to the true merit of a work of fiction than this constant presentation of personal beauty as a make-weight against the crooked morality of a low nature. The one is only a kind of outside fact to the reader, a mere bit of colouring; the other is the very soul of the story. Intrinsic worthlessness is not rendered interesting by continually dwelling on the pair of dark blue Irish eyes that have such witchery in their glances; and a snob is a snob all through, though he has a crop of golden curls and stands six foot two in his stockings. And when we are expected to be interested in the former, and to feel benevolently towards the latter, notwithstanding their joint worthlessness and because of

* *Bright Morning*. By Maria M. Grant, Author of "Artista." 3 vols. London : Chapman & Hall. 1873.

their joint beauty, we are only conscious of the author's unsubstantiality of treatment, and the want of a true insight and a high ideal.

The sensuality of *Bright Morning* is persistent and wearisome. It is stuffed full of dark eyes and scarlet lips, of hands that touch each other lingeringly in the twilight, and of heads that bend close together, with the dangerous consequences that follow. If a man looks handsome, a girl falls in love on the spot; if a woman looks bewitching, a man is ready to play the fool or the scoundrel, as his nature determines. Ogling is about the strongest line the fishers of hearts can throw; and Godfrey forswears Trixie, with whom he is desperately in love after his manner, because Adelaide Cathcart looks into his face, "and her eyes were very pleasing to him, so soft and dark, and so near his own." This Adelaide Cathcart, by the way, is a cold and heartless heiress with whom Godfrey has flirted in the past season, and made way. She has no love to give, having in her turn encountered the fate so liberally accorded by novel-writers to their ladies, which doomed her to a lifelong sorrow, effectually concealed by a liberal amount of flirting and the astuteness of an old gambler in making her game. She is rich, handsome, and a *parvenu*. It behoves her then to marry station for the one part and good looks for the other. At the moment when she looks into Godfrey Hamilton's face she is undecided between him and Lord Harry Palgrave. She has been questioning Godfrey of "the romantic story, you know, about your lady-love up in the North—your engagement, you know;" and he for answer has replied, "Rubbish; who could have told *you* such a story?" "Why not to me?" says Adelaide; and then their eyes meet, "hers dark and soft, and near his own." The scene goes on thus:—

"Why not to me?" she repeated.

"Because you are the last person I should have imagined could have believed such a thing," he answered her; and then his hand stole out in the dusky firelight, and for one moment his fingers closed fast on hers. She let him hold her hand for an instant.

He looked very handsome as he bent towards her in the fire-glow, a hot flush on his cheek, a bright glitter in his eyes.

"I think I will marry him!" she whispered to herself. "Harry Palgrave is such a hopeless fool!"

"Is it not true?" she said aloud, and her gaze still softened as it sank into his.

Ah, Godfrey! He would have found courage to face the bristling ramparts of a fortress, to walk to the very cannon's mouth; but with her eyes still upon him, with her hand still touching his, no courage came, no power to speak, in truth, the answer to her words.

"You are the last person who should believe such stories," he said.

And then some one interrupted them, and he rose from the sofa by her side.

"It is all a *canard*," she thought to herself; "he is fair game yet. I think I'll throw over Harry Palgrave, after all. Poor Harry!" and then she went off to dress.

After this we hear of a love-letter from Trixie, "warm and rich with tender names and little sweet love words," which "made his cheeks crimson and his heart beat anew." So Godfrey, or "Goff" for short, goes on for a few more sentences, vacillating between his love in the North and his enchantress in the South, with duns and debts to strengthen the hands of the latter, "whose subtle influence was gathering round him like a spell." It is some consolation to know that this "six feet two of such physical energies" loses both ladies; giving up one and being given up by the other; and that he disappears as a "failure," in the odour not of sanctity but of Basinghall Street.

After her disappointment through Godfrey, Trixie, having grown hard, and dangerous about the eyes, marries Mr. Forde, the wealthy shipbuilder, to whom she behaves with infinite ill-temper and want of feeling. He is not described as a very charming or fascinating man, but he is kind and generous, and he loves his pretty doll with truth and fervour, deserving better things at her hands than those she gives him. The marriage is unhappy, mainly owing to the young wife's morose humours; Mr. Forde, after trying to make matters better, yielding to the inevitable, and accepting his bitter fate with a spirit as hard and as morose as her own. They have a boy; and here Miss Grant's muse, from being sickly, becomes sickening. If such a child and such a mother were met in real life, how heartily tired of both we should be before ten minutes had passed! It is all in this strain:—

Trixie sat on a low chair near the window, and her boy, with his arms flung round her, leant his fair head back upon her shoulder, and was laughing in bright saucy triumph into her face.

They had been evidently having a contest, and Rupert had won; and she held him close to her, and bent over him a countenance flushed with exertion, and eyes full of eager tenderness, half-amused, half-unwilling, yet glad to yield, a countenance so lovely—it seemed to Jim as if it came to him from his dreams.

Jim looked into the handsome proud young face, and said nothing. It was such a curious picture to him, the combination; the little delicate features had the strong, determined expression he remembered in the countenance of the boy's father, and the blue shadowy eyes, the flushed cheek, the passionate quivering lip, were moulded and coloured with the rich warmth of his mother's beauty.

"Ru, go to your tea," said Trixie presently; "it is half-past five; it is more than time."

He looked at her from his contemplation of Jim with an indolent, half-rebellious glance, and hesitated a moment, then unexpectedly he made up his mind to go.

"Poor stern undemonstrative Andrew Forde," who "worshipped the child" and who happened to be only his father, is nowhere in this nursery idyl; and, by way of a last endeavour to exercise some authority in his own house, he takes the boy away in secret and

puts him to a school where his mother cannot find him. On this of course Trixie goes mad, or what is equivalent to mad; and Godfrey, who has come home again, and is singing his wings and hers by fluttering round the flame of an unlawful love, takes advantage of her distracted state to lure her away with him, and thus ruin her character for ever. If it had not been for "Jim," otherwise James Lindsay, her cousin, who had loved her undeclared and undetected all his life, she would have been destroyed in fact as she is in appearance. The incident is not too delicate, but it is only too much in harmony with the prevailing tone of the book; and, unpleasant as it is, comes in as the natural consequence of what has gone before. In the end the boy and the husband and Godfrey Hamilton all die; and Trixie is thus free to marry her faithful swain, and to reward a constancy that had withstood all assaults.

We have a word or two, however, to say about Jim Lindsay. He is the *preux chevalier par excellence* of the story; the man of merit and of virtue, pure, true, and manly. But even he can moon and gloat over the idea of seeing Trixie again when he returns from India to England, though he knows that she has been married for seven years; and when he goes with her to the nursery, and they both look on the sleeping child, "a wild, strong, intoxicating temptation" to tell her that he loved her, and had always loved her, nearly overpowered him. Because she did not love her husband, he argued that it "could not be sin now, surely, to bend over her in her utter loneliness, and whisper his lifelong devotion into her ear." We fear that Miss Grant's method would prove more pleasant than safe to souls battling with temptation and the Seventh Commandment; and that if the virtuous men think they may make love to a married woman over the bed of her child, because she has been an undutiful and unloving wife, there would be but little chance for poor shivering morality when it came to the vicious ones. If Joseph may palter with sin, what of Juan? Add to this questionable morality a loaded style, peculiarities of grammar that defy the authority of Lindley Murray, and a general air of slipslop that never deviates into correctness or dignity, and we have the main characteristics of a poor and worthless book.

THE REGISTER OF ARCHBISHOP GRAY.*

WE are always glad to get a new volume from the Surtees Society. Their books always contain sterling matter, and their range spreads over so wide a field in point of time as to supply something for almost any taste which is a taste for past times at all. They give us matter ranging from the earliest days of Northumbrian Christianity down to the contemporaries of the Restoration of Charles the Second. Beda and Cosin come alike within the sphere of Surtees' editorship. The volume which Mr. Raine here gives us belongs to an intermediate stage. It has to do with perhaps the most famous of the Archbishops of York in the thirteenth century. Walter Gray is, we suspect, best known from a wonderful story, to be found in *Matthew Paris*, or what we commonly call *Matthew Paris* (for of course it is really Roger of Wendover), and in a more modern form in *Godwin's Catalogue*, how he stored up corn for five years, how it was eaten of rats and mice—the later writer prudently substitutes "mures," a somewhat vague word, for the more definite and less likely "sorices," or shrews of the earlier—and how the snakes and adders and terrible toads put their noses out of the stack, and how "moreover they all heard an unknown voice saying unto them, Let the corn alone, for the Archb. and all he hath is the devil's possession." Mr. Raine evidently thinks much better of Walter Gray, who certainly was a man who played a great part both in national and local affairs; and even in the matter of the corn one would like to have some surer witness against him than that of toads, snakes, and unknown voices. Walter Gray held the see of York for forty years. And Mr. Raine tells us that he was the first English prelate who has left a Register behind him. He also tells us that this is the first Register of the kind which has been actually printed in England, though there is another—also from the province of York, though from the diocese of Durham—now printing in the series of *Chronicles and Memorials*. To the Register itself Mr. Raine has added by way of Appendix a great number of other documents in which Walter Gray was concerned, gathered together from various quarters. The Register itself consists of two distinct rolls, the entries in which begin in the year 1225, the records of the first two years of Walter's archiepiscopate having been lost. A great many of the entries are naturally only of a formal kind—records of institutions and such like ministerial acts. In these cases Mr. Raine has not thought it needful to reprint the whole of these documents, which of course include a great deal of mere legal phraseology which cannot differ greatly in each particular case. Documents of this class Mr. Raine has been contented to calendar, giving merely a summary in English. But he assures us that he has preserved every fact which these formal entries contain, and especially that he has given all the proper names in such shape as he finds them in the Register, whether right or wrong. Documents of any intrinsic interest he of course prints at length in the original. These different ways of treating documents which are brought close together in the same or in opposite pages give some parts of the book rather an odd look, and in the hands of some editors we can fancy that the practice might be

* *The Register, or Rolls, of Walter Gray, Archbishop of York.* With Appendices of Illustrative Documents. Published for the [Surtees] Society by Andrews & Co., Durham; Whittaker & Co., London, &c. 1872.

dangerous. We believe however that Mr. Raine may be trusted to settle what is worth giving in full and what is not, and certainly, for all general and for most local purposes, it is enough to have the names and dates without the endless repetition of the mere formulae in each case. The documents which Mr. Raine has collected in his two Appendices are of course given at full length, and these are naturally more valuable for general purposes than the Register itself. Here is a specimen of the form which these documents take in the abridged form given them by Mr. Raine:—

Clavereburg, Kal. Dec. 14th, 1229.—License, with the consent of the prioress and convent of Selsford, patrons, M. the rector and R. the vicar of Lexington, for dom. R. de Laxinton to build a chapel "in curia sua de Laxinton," and to have a chaplain ministering there, reserving the rights of the parish church. By the hand of Mr. Simon de Evesham.

Here we learn less than usual, for the names of some of the parties concerned are not given in full. But in this respect the perfect document itself could not have been any fuller, and we see how everybody was described, who was "Dominus" and who was "Magister." Mr. Raine's "Mr." has a singularly modern look as applied to these thirteenth-century personages. But as he uses it throughout as a received abbreviation for "magister," there seems to be nothing to be said against it.

Mr. Raine in his Preface gives a general sketch of the state of things during the time that the see of York was held by Walter Gray. We must remember that during the fifteen years of his incumbency he was one of the chief persons in the kingdom, and was constantly employed in public affairs and holding great offices of all kinds. Yet it certainly does not seem that he neglected his own diocese, like his more famous successor, Wolsey, who never found time even to be enthroned till after his fall from temporal power. Walter Gray was evidently a great deal in his diocese, and he was constantly moving about to different parts of it when he was there. Mr. Raine gives a list of his movements during the year 1228, in which he appears in a great number of his houses and in other places in the diocese; indeed he seems seldom to have stayed a whole week in any one place. It must however be noted that, among these many places of archiepiscopal dwelling or sojourn, the metropolitan city itself is not to be found. The old connexion between the Bishop and his own church was fast falling asunder. Mr. Raine has a good deal to say about capitular matters. It is plain that in Walter Gray's time the Chapter had by no means lost its primitive character as the Bishop's Council, though the way in which it acted as such was beginning to take a rather strange form. Walter Gray seemingly did not trouble himself often to preside in the Chapter-house at York; but in 1227 he got a Bull from Pope Honorius the Third to allow "quatuor personae maiores et digniores Eboracensis ecclesie"—that is to say, the Dean, Precentor, Chancellor, and Treasurer, who were of course bound to strict residence at York—to come to the Archbishop wherever he might be, and give him the benefit of their counsels, without such absence being reckoned as breach of residence or involving any consequent loss of income. The license however ends with a warning against this liberty of occasional absence being turned into permanent non-residence:—

Dum tamen tales se per hoc ab ecclesia continuo non absentent per quod ipsa eorum obsequio defraudetur.

In another letter of the same Pope in the same year we find a question about a certain "Magister Laurentius de Sancto Nicholao," whom the Pope describes as "Subdiaconus et capellanus noster," who, like many other foreigners in those days, held English preferment in the form of a prebend at York. This prebend, it seems, had no particular endowment, but had simply a share in the common revenue of the church, whether its holder were present or absent ("tempore praedecessorum eius non erat aliquis certi valoris, nec consistebat in aliquo certo loco, sed tantummodo in communis, que quandoque plus quandoque minus pro tempore varietate valebat, ejusque proventus, sive presentes essent sive absentes, percipiebant in duobus terminis annuatim"). But Archbishop Gray himself and his Chapter had lately made a statute, on account of the small number of canons who kept residence ("qui valde pauci canonici residentiam in ecclesia facient")—they at least did not look forward to a time when there should be only one—by which those canons only were to have a share in the dividend who kept residence and attended the services. By this statute the holder of the particular prebend held by Master Lawrence was to have as his corps a yearly payment of six marks, whether he resided or not, with a share in the divisible property if he resided. As these six marks formed a less income than that of the prebends in general ("qui præbenda illa quam contulisti prefato magistro respectu aliarum nimis videtur exilia"), the Archbishop had further given him the church of Trelinton or Tockerington. On this the Dean and Chapter took occasion to refuse Master Lawrence his payment of the six marks on the ground of his being otherwise provided for, and the Pope writes to the Archbishop because this alleged wrong is to be redressed. This is one of those pieces of capitular history which show how nearly the same questions were going on in different places at the same time. Walter Gray at York was contemporary with Jocelin at Wells, and both were doing the same work, that of tempting their canons into residence, by making it their interest to reside. The stage of throwing hindrances in the way of residence, in order to increase the incomes of those who are already residing, came later.

Another matter about which there is a great deal in these

documents is the jurisdiction of the Archbishops of York over the Archbishops of Scotland. Mr. Raine sets forth his private opinion on this matter in a shape which to many will sound startling:—

It is sometimes said that the Northern Convocation is too small in numbers. I long to see the Scottish bishops recluded among the suffragans of York. The greatest blow that Scotland ever inflicted upon her Church was when she made it independent of York.

It is plain that in Walter Gray's time the Archbishop of York exercised full metropolitan jurisdiction over the see of Whitherne, or Candida Casa. At one time we find the Archbishop summoning the King of Scots to appear and discuss matters touching the election to that see. In another case we find Archbishop Walter and King Alexander joining to annul the election of the convent. Anyhow it is plain that the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of York in those parts was at least as fully acknowledged as that of the King of Scots, whom the convent speaks of in a somewhat significant way as "Dominus Rex Scotie qui modo Galwezzam tenit." But we do not find the Archbishop exercising any authority in any other diocese either of the kingdom of Scotland or of the other lands held by its King. We get however some notices of the Bishopric of Man, and of the fact, of which we should like some explanation, that the electors to that see were the abbot and convent of Furness. The see was then held to be suffragan to the province of Nidaros or Trondhjem in Norway; but as the perils of the sea were so great that the Bishops of Man could hardly ever get at their metropolitan, Innocent the Fourth allows that they shall be confirmed and consecrated by the Archbishops of York.

We mark in one entry of 1229 two persons described as Hugh the son of Waltheof and Edusa (Hadwisa?) the daughter of Alwy (Elfwig). This is one of the endless instances in which we find the Norman names supplanting the English, the father being called after the elder, and the children after the newer, fashion.

We quote the following passage from Mr. Raine's preface:—

In one instance only do I find the archbishop mentioned in connection with education, and that is in the gift of a house in Oxford, called Black Hall, to the University, which was then really contained in the college of that name. In making this donation he had before him the example of one of his own friends—William of Lanham, Archdeacon of Durham and Canon of York. This brings the Archbishop into close connexion with the true founder of University College, and therefore of the University of Oxford, on which the gratuitous assumption of a remote antiquity confers nothing but the ridicule of scholars.

We are thankful to any one who will help us in showing up "the fable of the millenarians"; but we do not understand what Mr. Raine means by the University being "really contained in the College of that name," or by "founder of University College, and therefore of the University of Oxford." The University began in the twelfth century, the Colleges in the thirteenth. Nor do we quite understand Mr. Raine when he says:—

In the infancy of cathedral institutions the bishop resided at the cathedral church, and was its head, an *abbot* acting under him, with the title of vice-dominus, who was probably the deputy of the prelate.

He adds that at York Archbishop Thomas the First "placed a dean in the room of the ancient abbat." As York was always secular, we cannot make out about the "abbat."

It must not be forgotten that Walter Gray was one of the great builders of the thirteenth century, and that his works are to be seen both at York and in his other minsters and houses. Among them is Bishopthorpe, where he bought the manor and gave it to the Chapter in trust for his successors. In the manor-house—vulgarly called the "Palace"—his chapel still remains, with a building not designed by him standing over it. In the true Palace at York—now utterly forsaken for the rural retreat—he built the chapel which now forms the library where Mr. Raine so worthily presides over the capitular treasures.

PERSIA AND "THE DEBATABLE LANDS."

IT would be difficult to over-estimate the usefulness of the task which Mr. Wheeler has lately undertaken to accomplish—the indication, namely, of "the political status of those countries which lie between Persia on the one side and Khiva, Bokhara, and Afghanistan on the other." But the difficulty, as well as the usefulness, of compiling trustworthy information on Central Asia has just been illustrated by our present geographical muddle over the boundary of Badakhshan, and also—we must say it—by the present work itself, for Mr. Wheeler's "political status" turns out to be something little short of chaos. The "Memorandum" reveals a state of things in which boundaries, principalities, and powers change and interchange in a manner suggestive of the doctrine of transmutation of energy. Mr. Wheeler very properly calls the border territories, of which he writes, "debatable lands"; and of these it would seem that Badakhshan is, or rather was, a continuation eastwards. To complete his sketch the author first submits a summary of modern Persian history, whose beginning is dated from about the year 1500, when religious bigotry or enthusiasm—always a convenient and potent political instrument in the East—enabled the Shiah prophet, Shah Ismail, to overthrow the Sunni successors of Timour, and

* *Memorandum on Persian Affairs; with a Supplementary Note on the Turkomans, Char-Eimaks, and Neistan.* By J. Talboys Wheeler, Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of British Burmah. Calcutta: Office of Superintendent of Government Printing. 1871.

to found the Sophi dynasty. Under the greatest of the Sophis, Shah Abbas, who reigned at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Persia reached the summit of its power and splendour—its limits reaching to the Oxus, and including Herat and Candahar. After him of course came the deluge; and Persia was despoiled of Georgia, Azerbijan, and Koordistan. An Afghan reign of terror lasted from 1722 to 1730, when cannibalism was openly practised in the streets of the capital. But at the second date the usual saviour of society appeared in a Khorassan robber, Nadir Shah, under whom Persia included the whole vast tract of territory from the Oxus and the Caspian to the Indus, and therefore the homes of those lawless scoundrels, the Turkomans, whose "independence," as it is styled, has at all times been a curse to their neighbours. Nadir Shah was a Sunni, therefore not loved, and, probably for the same reason, murdered at the holy Shiah shrine of Meshed. After him came the Zend dynasty, whose representatives distinguished themselves by deeds of orthodox atrocity—poisoning their rivals, or beating out their brains "with wooden mallets." Even the noblest characters in that nation which has been styled an Oriental France occasionally break out like wild beasts. Loot, last of the Zendas, is described as "the ideal of an Iranian warrior"; yet he burnt a man alive for a comparatively slight offence, of which, after all, it was not clear that the victim was guilty. But the most appalling monster of them all was Agha Mohammed Khan, the first king of the now reigning Kajar dynasty. He is described as a shrivelled diminutive eunuch, who blinded 7,000 inhabitants of Kerman on the charge that they had assisted in the escape of his rival, and afterwards tore out the eyes of Loot with his own hands. Agha's triumphal pyramid of skulls was seen by Sir Henry Pottinger in 1810, thirteen years after its erection. But the long reign—1796 to 1834—of Agha's nephew and successor, Futtah Ali, was a vast improvement upon that of any of his predecessors. The residence of English, French, and Russian representatives gave a new dignity to the Persian Court, whose interests were thenceforth intimately bound up with the course of European politics; and the moral force of the presence of a superior civilization was revealed in the abandonment of old and barbarous modes of execution, and in the gradual adoption of European manners. Yet our "Memorandum" shows how, even in Futtah Ali's time, the old Adam of savagery could break out on provocation. And Futtah's descendant, who, in spite of the pious arguments and warnings of the Mollahs, is determined to be the first Persian Shah to visit England, could tell tales of some unlovely scenes at which his own Majesty assisted—when headless bodies of Turkomans were dragged through the camp, and their bodiless heads paid for in hard cash.

Like other Asiatic princes ambitious of emulating Alexander, Darius Hystaspes, Timour, and other historic conquerors, Futtah Ali signalized his reign by repeated efforts to win back the limits of the old empire of Nadir Shah. Mr. Wheeler points out that some of these attempts were made in conscious violation of international law, according to which the Shah's claims must have become invalid after a lapse of sixty years. This argument, however, cannot apply to the case of the province of Khorassan, reconquered by Agha in 1796. Many readers will be surprised to learn how very recently it was that this important province became an integral portion of Persia. Indeed it would appear from the "Memorandum" that, until the year 1848, Khorassan might pretty correctly be described as "a debatable land." It was under the sway of petty chiefs who owed obedience to the "prince-governor" at Meshed, and paid it when it pleased themselves. Abbas Mirza, the ablest of these lieutenants, subdued the refractory chiefs in 1830; but they broke out again in 1835, during the reign of Mahmood Shah, the third Kajar. Once more they rebelled in the year 1848—the present Shah then reigning—while the Turkoman hordes went plundering over the province. Quite different, however, was the point of international law with respect to Herat, which Persia unsuccessfully attempted to seize in 1809, and again in 1817. The blood-and-iron argument having failed, the prince-governor, Abbas Mirza, in 1830 had the pleasure of securing the person of the Herati Minister, and then, by way of assuring him of the righteousness of the Shah's claims, drew two of his Excellency's teeth. It is gratifying to learn that the worthy Mirza had only the teeth for his trouble, and that Yar Mahomed went home to Herat with great *delat*. It will hardly be necessary to remind our readers that the subsequent attempts of Persia on Herat ended in the Paris treaty of 1857, according to which "the Shah relinquished all claim to suzerainty in Herat and the countries of Afghanistan, and engaged to abstain from all interference in their internal affairs." Similar claims were made on Beloochistan in 1839, but that country revolted in about ten years, and since that time it appears to have remained independent. Lastly, after Nadir's death, the little territory of Seistan passed to the Afghans, and subsequently became independent. No doubt the public will soon be in possession of the political and geographical facts ascertained by the recent British mission to Seistan. Meanwhile we may state, on the authority of the "Memorandum," that "on every pretext" Persia renewed her claims every year after 1853; that in 1863 Lord Russell told the Persian Minister that the Shah and the Afghans must fight it out between them; that in 1867 the Shah established a permanent fort in the territory; and that in 1868 the debatable land formed part of the Persian district of Kayn. Now since, according to the "Memorandum," the districts on the north-western frontier of Afghanistan seem to be

still more "debatable" than Seistan, it is not easy to understand on what grounds Lord Granville considers our "ally's" western frontier too well defined to be disputed. According to the map the Huzaras are the subjects of the Afghan Ameer; but according to this compilation the Huzaras are so much their own masters that their fellow-subjects the Heratis are, or have lately been, "a drug" in their slave markets.

The Persians, however they may have violated international law in their career on their Eastern frontier, have had reason enough for interference in Turkomania. Their endless and unsatisfactory wars with those whom we may call the dangerous classes of Cis-Oxania have been—sometimes at least—matter of absolute necessity. What were they to do with people who regarded plunder and kidnapping as the only respectable way of making a living, and who, being pious Sunnis, naturally counted the heretic Shiabs fair booty? Shah Abbas tried what Anglo-Indians would call a "buffer policy," by colonizing Koords on the frontier, and inducing them to keep the peace for a consideration. But in process of time these Koordish constables fraternized with the Turkomans, and became as arrant thieves as they. In 1830 Abbas Mirza marched against the Turkoman headquarters in Sarakhs—now marked in Khorassan—and liberated three thousand Persian slaves, who fell on one hundred and fifty slave dealers and literally tore them to pieces. After that period they owed, it seems, allegiance to the Khan of Khiva, maintaining it of course only when convenient. Sarakhs is called one of "the four chief cities of Khorassan"; but it would perhaps be difficult to say whether it is thoroughly Persian. Still more uncertain is—or lately was—the question of the ownership of at least the Northern portion of the Atrek valley. Quite recently a contemporary sounded the alarm over its discovery of "a secret treaty" by which Persia had in 1870 ceded the valley to Russia. But Lord Enfield has since declared, first, that the highest authorities both in Persia and Russia have emphatically disclaimed any knowledge of any such treaty; and, secondly, that "the territories described did not belong to Persia." In fact, the geography and "political status" of all the Turkoman tribes, or dangerous classes, south of the Oxus seem to be in the same state of glorious uncertainty. The Ersari Turkomans, for example, have over and over changed homes and masters, and at present their allegiance seems to be due either to the Khan of Khiva or to Russia's dependency—Bokhara. But of all the Turkoman cities, Merv has given most trouble to Persia. In 1860 the Persians suffered a terrible defeat there—retreating with only 2,000 men out of an army of 40,000. In 1840 Conolly passed by its slave-market, and its "pens," in which unfortunate men, women, and children were "handled like cattle." And in 1855 "the inhabitants were such desperate slave-dealers, that if a man or woman were incalculable enough to go to the river alone, he or she were sure to be seized and carried off into slavery." In 1867 the Persians again joined issue with the Turkomans, with what result does not appear. We need not follow Mr. Wheeler's "Memorandum" any further, for the story of Sarakhs or of Merv is that of every other Turkoman locality. Most readers will agree with the author that those lawless nomads can only be restrained by terror of some strong power. It seems at least that their abominable slave traffic might be suppressed simply by stopping the demand at Khiva.

GREGORY HAWKSHAW.*

IT were much to be wished that there were more authors who sought somewhat the same kind of renown as was gained last century by Single-Speech Hamilton, and who, after having written one good work, instead of writing more, would quietly rest on their fame, and hope that to their name might in time be tacked the epithet of Single-Book. And yet, however much the world noticed the after silence of a man who had shown that he knew how to speak, it might not perhaps be equally surprised at the silence of a man who had shown that he knew how to write. The range of subjects that fall within a speaker's knowledge and interest can scarcely be so confined but that he will from time to time find some matter coming up on which he can speak, and speak well; whereas a writer in his first work may have given forth all that he had to say on a matter which he had for years made his sole study, and which perhaps till he wrote had been but little touched on. Or he may have had in him a curious vein of humour which, though worth working, was nevertheless soon worked out. Or, without having any great literary power, he may have been brought by circumstances into a strange kind of life which he was able to describe with simplicity and truth. When it was said of Milton that he lost by *Paradise Regained* what he had gained by *Paradise Lost*, it was stated of him with an exaggeration that is carried off by the wit, what may, if generally expressed, be said with more or less truth, that a writer often loses by his second work whatever reputation he has gained by his first. More especially is this the case with the last of the three classes of writers whom we have just described; those, namely, who, not being really masters of the author's craft, have yet seen something worth telling, and have been able to tell it with a certain freshness and force. The author of *Tom Brown*, for instance, however successful he may have been in describing the life of a Rugby school-

* *Gregory Hawkshaw; his Character and Opinions.* By the Author of "Colonial Adventures and Experiences by a University Man." London: Bell & Daldy. 1873.

boy, failed utterly when he tried to write the life of an Oxford undergraduate. His first book, with all its faults of style, was interesting, because the writer had opened up a new kind of young life, and wrote with enthusiasm and knowledge. Many an author had told us of the tricks of naughty boys, and many an author had told us of the morality and the piety of good boys. But no one till Mr. Thomas Hughes wrote had traced the growth of that portent of these latter days, the Muscular Christian, who combines all the daring and liveliness of the naughty boy who used to be so dear to us in Smollett or in Marryat with the morality of a hero of Miss Edgeworth and the piety of a hero of Miss Yonge. Then, too, in Dr. Arnold he had to draw the character of a great man whom he had been happy enough to know in his youth, at the time when hero-worship comes most easily. There was nothing, however, in *Tom Brown's School Days* to lead any one who was capable of forming a judgment to suppose that its author would ever bring forth a second story worth reading. "Nec viget quidquam simile aut secundum" may be applied with truth to the first book of such an author as this, if he is so misguided as to follow it up by others. No doubt it now and then happens that one of those writers who are only able to bring forth one good book makes an improvident bargain with his publisher, and so gets little more than a name as his share of reward. He is little to be blamed in that case if he tries to trade upon his name, and to use the reputation of his first work to sell a second. More frequently, however, it happens, we suspect, that he himself, having no critical faculty, is unable to take a just measure of himself and his writings, and is utterly unaware how large a share in his success belongs to his subject.

Such, we have little doubt, is the case with the author of the work before us. His *Colonial Adventures and Experiences by a University Man* was a lively book, and was favourably received. We ourselves read it with interest, and had much pleasure in saying a good word for it. The author had not only a good deal that was interesting to tell of Queensland, the colony which he described, but he had quite as much that was interesting to tell of himself and of that unfortunate class of men—far too large—to which he belonged. His life, so far as it had gone, had been unsuccessful, and he was not ashamed to let the fact be known. He had done nothing at the University, and in the colony he had been little better than a hewer of wood and a drawer of water. Moreover, even at this drudge's work he had done but badly. He had learnt that the philosopher's stone is not to be picked up in Australia, and that if El Dorado is there, it refuses to open its treasures except to those who are good at pick-axe and shovel. He had come across a good deal of curious company, varied indeed in many respects, but almost all alike in having begun badly and gone from bad to worse. He was, as he himself tells us, saved from the utter ruin which befell so many of his comrades who had received a liberal education by the happy fact that he was disinclined to hard drinking. By the kindness of friends he was at last rescued from a life for which he was unfit, and came back to England to make a fresh start. Now, though he was by no means the first University man who had gone through the greatest hardships in one of our colonies, yet, so far as we know, he was the first to make known, not only how much he had suffered, but also how he had brought on himself what he had suffered. In the frankest manner possible he lets us into all the foolish hopes he had dangled before himself when in England, and the utter hopelessness into which he soon sunk when in Australia. He had no false shame in telling us of the shifts he had been put to in getting food and lodging, or in making known to the world that a happy bodily temperament had saved him from a drunkard's fate. He had a curious story to tell, and he was lively in telling it. He wrote as long as he had anything worth saying, and when he finished his story, he finished his book. Now, even though a man has failed in a University and failed in a colony, and not only knows that he has failed, but is willing that the world should know it too, we do not therefore, lively though the narrative of his failures may be, at once jump to the conclusion that he is fit to turn author, and to write with a tone of authority on all the questions, little and big, of the age. We should have hoped that our author might, partly at Oxford and partly in Queensland, have attained that knowledge of himself which would have kept him from a third time falling into an absurd estimate of his own powers. He will have to learn by experience that, just as a luxurious college life does not fit a man for the backwoods, so the drudgery of the backwoods does not fit a man for oracular utterances on all matters, theological, moral, political, and social. We left him but a short while ago pleased with his simple modesty; we come back to him offended by his absurd conceit. We are acquainted with A. K. H. B. and his "Recreations," and of course Mr. Sala is not unknown to us; yet we do not believe that we ever read a sillier or a more wordy book than *Gregory Hawkshaw, his Character and Opinions*. We shall probably not do the author injustice if we assume that he himself is his own hero under the most transparent of disguises. Gregory had failed in his University career, had failed in the colonies, had come to England by the aid of friends, and had published a book which was a success. The delight is very evident with which he introduces Gregory's opinion on all kinds of subjects, expressed in the longest of passages. "Here," on one occasion he says, *a propos* of nothing, "by way of commenting I will insert an unpublished fragment expressing Gregory's views on prejudice." Thereupon follow six or seven pages on prejudice, beginning with its deriva-

tion from *præ* and *judicium*, which might have been stolen from the *Recreations of a Country Parson* or *A Gentle Life*. Who but has suffered under such passages as the following?—

It is then of the abstract prejudice, which underlies and influences our feelings, that we wish here to discourse. If we are able to give a sensible reason for our tastes or antipathies, these are not prejudices at all, for if we judge the actions of others before the fact, our judgment is sure to be wrong, and contemptible, and stupid.

All prejudice, or judgment, without a knowledge of facts, must be wrong and unfair.

There are two distinct kinds of prejudice, one proceeding from weakness of intellect, the other from a twist in the understanding; this latter kind of prejudice we call bigotry.

Besides Prejudice, we find settled off for us more or less briefly, in no order at all, Compulsory Attendance at College Chapels, Special Training for the Church, Baptismal Regeneration, Special Providences, Women's Rights, Duties of Godfathers in Baptism, Marriages, High Church, Sunday Schools, the Elevation of the Cup in the Sacrament, Private Schools, Corporal Punishment, Natural Laws and Forces, Novels, Women, Belief, the Punishment of Death, and Mother with a capital letter and in italics. We have not in this list nearly exhausted all the subjects which Mr. Gregory Hawkshaw to his own satisfaction has so fully treated. We should do the author an injustice nevertheless if we were to lead our readers to believe that *Gregory Hawkshaw* is what is called a serious book, and one which, like the two we have named above, it would be a credit to be found reading on a Sunday. So far is this from being the case, that there is no doubt that the author, perhaps without knowing it, has copied from Sterne and from Thackeray, as well as from the severer moralists who still grace this age. When he wrote the opening chapters of the story he was probably fresh from *Tristram Shandy*, and thought that he, too, could catch Sterne's trick. How far he has succeeded the following extract will show:—

But, good gracious! where, oh my pen, art thou conducting me?—I find that in these few pages I have actually had my hero born, christened, and married. He has written a love-letter which is waiting for an answer.

I have alluded to so many events in his career, that, upon my life, I hardly know which to explain first. I have also introduced no less than three generations of Hawkshaws. I only hope I have not perplexed my readers as utterly as I have myself.

He soon, however, turns from Sterne to Thackeray, and we have him heading each fresh piece of moralizing by addressing his readers as "My friends," or "Oh! my brothers." It would have been well if he had remembered that *sibi constet* was the motto that Thackeray kept before himself, not only in the conception of a whole work, but also of every passage in it. Our author may, if he pleases, parody Thackeray as closely as he can, and bring in Amaryllis, Melibeus, and Dametas. But if he looks for his readers to keep in their laughter, let him not at the end of his fine passage turn Amaryllis into Hamaryllis and make a joke about "am sandwiches." He is far safer in imitating Mr. Sala, as on the one hand he is much more likely to succeed, while, on the other hand, if he does not, his critics will regard his failure with indifference. We could have almost thought that it was the veteran Correspondent himself who was writing when we read:—

How is it, I wonder, that a long pointed instrument, dipped in a black fluid, and placed in a man's hand, becomes instantly imbued with life and thought?

When a man begins to fall into such wondering as this, he had much better either keep clear of "long pointed instruments" and "black fluid," or else, if he must write, he should carefully commit what he has written with all speed to the flames. Our author's pen becomes "imbued" with memory quite as much as with thought. He tells a well-known story of the discovery by some settlers of a shipwrecked sailor who had been for years kept prisoner by the blacks, and coolly applies it to his own hero. The man, as the story is always told, when seen had called out "Don't shoot! me British object." Our author adds—though here at least we daresay we ought in fairness to allow that he is original—that his name was "James Morell." At all events, whether original or not, the name gives room for the following pleasantry:—

His name was James Morell. "And," interrupted Gregory junior, with the idea of saying something witty, "was he the man who wrote the English Grammar?"

"Of course he was," said Gregory. "Don't you see he wanted to prove that he really did know the difference between the subject and the object?"

Nothing is more difficult than, without wearying our readers, to bring home to them the utter wearisomeness of a really wearisome book. A passage here and there from a book whose dulness spreads over 379 full pages can no more enable them to judge of the whole work than the brick or two which the man took with him enabled the purchaser to judge of the whole house. Dulness in itself is harmless enough; it is only when it is joined with flippancy that it becomes offensive. If any readers think that we have dealt too severely with *Gregory Hawkshaw, his Character and Opinions*, let them first, like us, wade through the book. When they have got to the end, we shall then be content to let our character as critics for justice and mercy rest in their hands.

ABBOTT'S LUCIAN.*

IT is not easy to estimate how much we owe to Lucian. If he did not, after dealing a death-blow to the crazy figments of heathendom and sham philosophy, assist in building up the faith that was permanently to supersede them, at least he opened a space for the new foundations by sweeping away the *débris* and rubbish of error. He taught the lesson, too, which has been studied with more or less success by modern satirists and humourists, of making truth and freedom of speech palatable and persuasive by a strong infusion of humour and gaiety. He dwelt for some time at Antioch, but without being led to embrace Christianity; he was possibly a friend of Origen's antagonist, Celsus, and certainly he was a writer to whom the stigma of scepticism has more or less attached itself. Lucian nevertheless would seem to have influenced Christian writers both of ancient and modern date by his lively exposures of the heathen mythology and his trenchant sallies upon the follies and vices of humanity. Few writers in any age have been able to enforce truth with a larger command of humour. Nor indeed, learned as he must have been, and encyclopedic in his researches into Pagan myths and philosophic dogmas, does Lucian frighten readers by any ostentation of learning. He is so bright and gay, and so much at ease with himself and his readers, that no part of the schoolboy's Greek curriculum comes to, or remains with, him more pleasantly. How far his "True History" influenced *Gulliver's Travels*, or how much Butler and Sterne and Rabelais and Cervantes owed to him directly or indirectly, is an inquiry into which we need not at present enter. But we may take for granted that the earliest notions of satire and of lively satiric dialogue which are supplied in the course of a liberal education come from the well-thumbed pages of Lucian in the *Analecta*, and in the *Scriptores Greci* (we speak from memory) in use at Eton. Hence it is that we are predisposed to welcome Mr. Abbott's selections from a favourite author more producible and easier to master than Aristophanes, and yet little, if at all, less entertaining. These selections include a fair sprinkling of the "Dialogues of the Gods," the "Dialogues of the Dead," and those of the Sea Deities, the two longer masterpieces of "Charon, or the Sight-seers," and "Timon the Misanthrope," and a probably early performance of Lucian, called the "Judgment of the Vowels," in which Tau is impeached by Sigma before the vowel dicta of aggression and spoliation. This last piece will be new to many readers of Lucian, and it is curious as expressing his views on spelling and pronunciation, very much as in his *Lixiphanes* he gave his opinion about strange and obsolete diction.

Thus the samples before us belong chiefly to the period of Lucian's life (circa 165 A.D.) when he had given up rhetoric for literature, and was enjoying competence and learned leisure at Athens after a good many years of instructive vicissitude and not less instructive travel. The pains which he had taken to correct his originally barbarous *patos*, his experience of human nature, and his varied observation of life in different capitals, all combine to furnish matter for amusing reflections and sketches. "Every phase of life is all likely to interest a literary man of the period of the Antonines" is brought before us in one or other of the dialogues or romances, "whilst amidst dramatic surroundings which mingle East and West, and make us 'verge at one time on the *Arabian Nights* and at another on the Dialogues of Plato,'" the cynic philosopher, the poor literary man, the demagogue, the parasite, or, on the other hand, the Greek God unveiled and in his naked inconsistency and abandonment to earthly passions, are figures that, one or other, always occupy the foreground. One learns to appreciate the extent to which the Olympian divinities were disestablished and undergoing disendowment in Lucian's day, when, as in the "Dialogues of the Gods," Ares and Hermes are made to mock at the fabled might of Zeus, the rays of whose lightning, we learn elsewhere, are sadly blunted and out of repair, through ineffectual launching at the sceptical sophist Anaxagoras ("Timon," § 10). In another Dialogue Apollo twits Hermes with the unreasonableness of the fabled immortality-by-halves of Castor and Pollux, an arrangement by which two notoriously devoted brothers could not possibly meet at any time after their apotheosis. In another ("D. Mortuorum," x.) it is Diogenes who finds a screw loose in Heracles's statement as to the distinction between his mortal and immortal parts, and, drawing him on by confusing questions, puzzles him as to the whereabouts of his soul, his eidolon, and his body. This last Dialogue is in Lucian's happiest style of Plato travestied.

Amongst the shorter Dialogues—as well as in the "Charon" and the "Timon"—are to be found lively and telling hits at the prevailing wickednesses and vices of his age, which bring Lucian upon ground occupied in a bitterer humour by Juvenal. The same capitals, and kindred conditions of society, must have nursed the avarice which in Dialogue VII. is represented as having brought poison-cups into fashion, and in Dialogues VIII. and IX. exhibits its votaries in the character of legacy-hunters, outwitting one another by each naming the other his heir, and publishing their wills prematurely, *ini θαύματος*, in the hope of the death of the legatee named. After death Cnemon admits that the little game of this kind betwixt him and Hermolaus has been a case of "diamond cut diamond." "And now," he says, "Hermolaus has got my property, like a big pike that, with the hook, has gorged the bait also." "Ay," responds his fellow-

shade, "and the angler withal, so that you did but scheme a device against yourself." In the next Dialogue the shades of the cynics Crates and Diogenes exchange views on the subject, and Diogenes makes a reflection which is badly rendered in the translation "by various hands" (1711). In reply to the remark of Crates that no legacy-hunter courted him, because all he could leave was impalpable, Diogenes suggests the reason of this in a very vague sentence, which avoids paraphrase, but utterly ignores the gist of the philosopher's remarks. Literally rendered, these would run as follows:—"With good reason; for they could not receive such goods from us, because they were spoilt by luxury, like worn-out rotten purses; so that if ever one did put into them wisdom, plain-speaking, or truth, out these would slip and vanish away, because the bottom could not hold them, as in the case of the Danaids pumping into the perforated cask. But gold they would retain, tooth and nail, and in every way." Whilst we are on the subject of translations, it may be said, in passing, that Lucian has fared ill in this respect, at least as far as England is concerned. The version to which we have referred, and for which Dryden wrote a careless life, is scandalously unfaithful and perfunctory. That of Franklin is better, but not very good; and Tooke's (1820), though it gives the general drift of Lucian's Dialogues and romances, too often ignores the niceties of allusion and comparison which frequently contain the wit and humour of a whole passage. None of the three translations at all comes up to the capacity which Mr. Abbott, in the bits he has translated here and there, evinces for this task.

Among the "Dialogues of the Dead," there is one between Menippus and Hermes which treats of the frail tenure of beauty, and is appropriately headed in the notes, "No Loveliness in the Grave." The whole tenor of it, as well as the particular passage where Menippus wonders that the Greeks did not see how brief a thing, and how fleeting as to bloom, was Helen's beauty, for which they contended so long, reminds us of the hymns "De Contemptu Mundi" which are to be found in Latin Hymnology, and of which the stock examples are the same as, or counterparts of, those in Lucian. The "Marine Dialogues" are perhaps the most attractive of all Lucian's shorter efforts, by reason of the graphic style in which minor sea deities relate to their kinsfolk or patrons such tales as Arethusa's flight, Arion's preservation, the Cyclope's blindness inflicted by Odysseus, or the Apple of Discord flung amongst the guests at Thetis's wedding. Most interesting of all is the account of the ravishment of Europa told to Nootus by Zephyr, who says 'twas the finest sea pageant he had ever witnessed since first he "began to be and blow" (*ἀρχεῖν οὐ γένεται καὶ πνίγει*). The attitude of Europa in Tennyson's description is a little different from that in Lucian, but not more finished or beautiful. One seems to see Europa on her bull in the words *ἡ δὲ πάντας ιεκλαγής τῷ πράγματι τῷ λαϊσ μὲν εὔχετο τοῦ κίραρος ὡς μὴ ἀπολιθάνοι, τῷ ἐπιρρέει τὸ ηγεμονίου τὸν πίκλον ξυνεῖται* (§ 2), and it is no wonder that all the commentators should agree in surmising that Lucian had some picture in his mind's eye when he described Europa and her bridal procession. Mr. Abbott reminds his readers in a note that ancient pictures on this subject have been found at Pompeii.

The most popular Dialogue in the volume before us, however, will assuredly be the first of the two larger pieces, "The Charon, or Sight-seers," in which Lucian gives full play to his rare gifts of graphic description, gay fancy, and pungent satire. Charon gets a day's holiday to visit the upper world, and, fearful of stumbling in the unaccustomed light of the upper world, persuades Hermes to be his cicerone. To get a panoramic view, they borrow the giant's stale device of piling Pelion and Ossa on Olympus, with Parnassus to "crown the edifice." As the pile is a trifling steep and shaky, the lame boatman wants a hand, and complains of the elevation; whereupon his waggish conductor encourages him with the remark, which would be not a bad motto for modern Alpine climbers, that to be safe and a sight-seer are incompatible roles (*οὐδὲ τὸν διέργειν οὐδὲ ἀργαλαῖν καὶ φιλοθέαματα είναι*) (p. 43). When the ascent is achieved, and Hermes has cried "Well done; all up!" and has perched himself on one peak of Parnassus, while Charon occupies the other, the boatman's sight is not clear enough for his present purpose till Hermes has improved it by a charm from Homer, which he applies at the same time with a quizzical injunction to remember the words and to have faith, and then he will see clearly. With his sight thus improved, Charon observes Milo the athlete, so soon to be tripped up by death, Cresus, and his conqueror Cyrus, Polycrates, and other types of uncertain earthly power; and comes to the conclusion, after general and particular scrutiny, that the upper world is a hive in which each bee has his own sting, and stings his neighbour, whilst a few wasps combine to pillage and plunder the larger and weaker body. He sees rare elements too of comedy in the manner in which the fondest hopes and ambitions are cut short, *ὑπὸ τοῦ βαλτίστον θαύματος*, or, as Mr. Abbott neatly translates, "by goodman Death"; and he is at a loss to discover what life is but a series of smaller and larger bubbles, of which the smaller burst at once, the larger and more complex later, but not less surely. "You must have remarked" (we quote from Tooke) "those bubbles that rise in the spray of a rapid torrent and swell into a foam. Of these bubbles the generality are so small that they instantaneously burst and vanish; others remain somewhat longer, and meeting more in their passage, with which they become confluent, they grow to a bigger tumour, but presently break as well as the former, because by the nature of them it cannot be

* Selections from Lucian; with English Notes. By Evelyn Abbott, of Balliol College, Oxford, and Assistant-Master at Clifton College. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1872.

otherwise. Exactly so does the life of man appear to me. All are for a short time tumid with the spirit of life, some more and others less; with many this inflation is of some, though very short, duration; others vanish the moment they arise; but break they must all" (Tooke's *Lucian*, vol. i. p. 377). When he has noted all this, Charon has a mind to proclaim it from his eyrie, but Hermes twists him with his simplicity. Does he not know that men's ears are full of wax, and that their minds are as Lethe? This lively drama ends with Hermes's answer to the inquiry of Charon as to the whereabouts of earth's greatest and most historic cities. Nineveh is gone; Babylon is going; as to Troy, Hermes will not venture to show it to Charon, lest he should throttle Homer for a liar when he gets back to Hades.

To any one who approaches the other larger Dialogue, the "Timon," under Mr. Abbott's guidance, we can promise equal amusement and edification. A very graphic Dialogue, the characters in which are somewhat minutely and pictorially drawn before they severally appear on the stage, affords great scope for the editor's running commentary, illustrations, and explanations. As we have already said, his bits of translation are creditably accurate, and they are not cramped because they aim at being literal. In places where Lucian, unlike himself, is confused as well as prosaic—e.g. in the sections that relate to the mask of Plutus—Mr. Abbott's help is useful. First it is Plutus, he tells us, who is supposed to wear the mask; then it is the rich man, and, lastly, Plutus and the mask are identical (See § 28, note). In an earlier Dialogue, his note on the construction of the "cithara" by Hermes (p. 5, cf. 106) throws the clearest light upon a somewhat difficult passage.

We have no right to find fault with Mr. Abbott for having withheld in most cases the English equivalents for the harder words in Lucian's rich and rare vocabulary. Are they not written in the Lexicon of Liddell and Scott? The tiro who hunts for them there will retain the meanings longer. By the way, he will also find in this text-book authority for a slang adverb which does not seem to go out of fashion. Eros describes Athens to his mother as "awfully masculine," *εὐως ἀρρενίκη* (p. 6). Perhaps it may be doubted whether a zeal for stimulating youthful research does not go too far when, on a sentence in p. 3, it leads Mr. Abbott to say that it is an example of the figure *Chiasmus*. It would have been just as well to explain briefly the nature of this figure, which reminds us of a sum in proportion. For the most part we have found the critical and explanatory notes sound and serviceable. There is some oversight or mistake in the note on *ἀντί ὡν οἱ εὐτροφομοισαντες* (cf. p. 19 and p. 119). In "Timon," §§ 45, too, we submit that *εἰνπερ-δέκινον ἀποβολεῖσθαινος* means not "pelting them from a height on the right hand"; but rather, as the examples in Liddell and Scott would prove, "pelting them from a vantage ground." But these slips are extremely few and far between.

The sole objection to making Lucian a much more general text-book, out of which boys might gather knowledge of Greek and at the same time sharpen their wits, is that here and there (Mr. Abbott takes pains to show where), Lucian's Greek, good as it is, is not Attic, but decidedly post-classical. To children of an older growth who have kept up their classics sufficiently to enjoy the Greek authors, and who can afford to be indifferent to the possible corruption of style, Lucian's lively writings, and especially the Dialogues of which Mr. Abbott supplies such excellent samples, will be excellent and delightful reading.

PEARL AND EMERALD.*

PEARL AND EMERALD may be described as an *Arabian Nights* tale run into a modern English mould and cast somewhat on the model of Dickens's Christmas stories. The wildest extravagance of fancy runs riot through the whole, and the incidents outrage all experience and probability almost as much as the leading conceptions of the plot. In his brief preface Mr. Francillon stands on his defence against the objections he expects from his critics. In the course of it he makes some assertions which appear to us almost as daring as anything in his story, and he draws conclusions from them with a freedom perfectly consistent with the laws of the world of wonder which we are about to enter. Because the limits of the likely and unlikely are so inextricably blended that it is often impossible to distinguish between the two, he seems to argue that you may persuade people to accompany you any distance into the country of the unlikely without their becoming conscious of having crossed the border. He does not wish his "readers to transport themselves into an ideal world," but he does "wish them to bear in mind that few things are improbable, that nothing is impossible, and that in matters of art imagination forms a boundless territory, into which ordinary practical experience has no right to intrude." Let these premisses be granted, and we do not see where the logical deductions from them need stop. A sculptor may embody in marble the most extravagant conceptions he can fetch from the furthest confines of that boundless territory of the imagination, and impose these monstrosities upon us as pure, although peculiar, types of art. So with writer who has madness in the blood, and has nursed his fevered brain on the more mystical fancies of men like Hawthorn, or the morbid horrors of sensationalists of the school of Mr. Harrison Ainsworth. He

gives himself the spur, when they put on the curb, and heaven only knows whither his unfettered imagination may hurry him. We do not mean to say that Mr. Francillon has reduced his own audacious theories to practice, avowedly extravagant as his story is. His sound sense and artistic instincts have saved him in great measure, but others who accepted his teaching might be less discreet. The sculptor we spoke of might embody his monstrosities in marble, but, artistic or not artistic, they would find neither admirers nor purchasers; while Mr. Francillon has written a book in which the persons have a real individuality for us, and their actions a decided interest, in spite of the extravagance of the incidents which bring these various individualities into play. That it should be so is the more creditable to his undoubted power; for if, as he tells us, he does not wish us to transport ourselves into an ideal world, he does his best to remind us at every turn that we are not living in a real one. The consequence is, lifelike as his leading characters are, his book suggests the playing of a pantomime where men and women are brought upon the stage attired like people in ordinary life; with their hats and umbrellas and shabby shawls, you might take them for respectable clerks and shopgirls going about their ordinary business, were it not for the paint and tinsel in the background, the professional costume of clown and harlequin, and the columbine's pirouetting in the dress of the ballet. If the triumph of fiction is to make the reader forget that it is fiction at all, it seems almost suicidal in an author wilfully to dispense with any possibility of creating an absolute illusion. While saying so much, however, we must give the author high praise for the dexterity with which in most instances he has confounded the commonplace and the extravagant; for the graceful art with which he has blended the probable, the possible, and the impossible. He mixes up matters of moonshine with matters of business in an easy and matter of fact way, as one might introduce an envoy from another planet in the act of negotiating a loan with a firm of financiers in the City. When you had once become fairly engrossed with the discussion over the terms of concession and the rate of commission, in studying the envoy's character and that of the City gentlemen with whom he does business, you might for the moment forget the intrinsic unlikelihood of Saturn seeking relief in the London money-market by borrowing terrestrial coin.

Thus the scenes of the tale lie for the most part in a thoroughly everyday world. The great house of Cranston has come to the ground with a crash, and the ruin has been even more widespread than the confidence reposed in it had been excessive. Its head, who has been trading for long on the phantom of his former credit, is unable to survive the disgrace of discovery and the loss of a reputation supposed to be spotless. His son Arthur, who is as honourable as he is eccentric, does his utmost to vindicate his father's name and credit by parting, for the benefit of the creditors, with all the property that has come to him by settlement. There is a sale of the priceless collection of pictures in the mansion in Grosvenor Square. The gems have been knocked down for fancy prices. Then the auctioneer puts up a worthless daub—a dead magpie, by Jones. The first bid is half-a-crown. Mr. Grode, a well-known dealer, notorious as a sharp hand, makes an advance of a shilling—by way of joke. A transcendently hideous Hebrew of the name of Levi outbids Grode. He sticks to the dealer, and as they run it up by trifling sums, he sees Grode endeavouring to suppress an excitement altogether out of keeping with the occasion. Thereupon he argues rapidly that whatever may be Grode's motive, it must be equally worth his while to outbid him. So convinced is he of this that he carries on the contest until his rival is constrained to come to a standstill from very inability to pay the price. Levi has the magpie for 80,000*l.* The scene is spirited from first to last, and indeed were we to criticize the novel by episodes instead of as a whole, we should cancel much we have written by way of prelude. We interest ourselves in the competition, although we foresee the result, and in our excitement we almost forget the staring improbability of a hard-headed and close-fisted Hebrew risking all the hard-won fortune of a lifetime on the idea that Grode must be in the secret of a miracle which makes a few inches of spoiled canvas, cheap at 80,000*l.* Of course we understand what the lucky Levi does not. He carries his bargain home, and rolls on the ground in an agony of rage and grief when he finds there is nothing concealed under the coarse coating of the magpie. Had he found an undoubted Apelles, the portrait of Alexander by that artist, for example, it could not have brought him home his 80,000*l.* When morning breaks on his wretchedness, a faint green light from the floor aids the feeble glimmerings of the dawn. Levi is master of the great emerald of Kandahar, the noblest known gem in the universe. There can be no mistake about it; for all the trade knew its weight to a carat, and each point and peculiarity about it; and the great emerald of Kandahar is notoriously worth 6,000,000*l.* sterling, neither more nor less. Mr. Levi has not made a bad bargain after all, although a thing is only worth what it will fetch, and there are certain ugly flaws in his title which seriously embarrass him later. Meanwhile Grode is in despair. Grode knows all that Levi has got for his money. Somehow he had been admitted to the secret when the late Mr. Cranston chose this singular hiding-place for the priceless gem; a gem which the Czar of Caspia had pledged with him for an advance of 1,200,000*l.* Grode becomes more desperate still when he is visited by a certain Count Kromaski, who dresses like a Frenchman and talks perfect English. The Count is the Czar's envoy, sent over to search out

* *Pearl and Emerald. A Tale of Gotham.* By R. E. Francillon. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1872.

the missing emerald, that the Caspian monarch may wear it on a grand State ceremonial. The finances of Caspia have improved so much of late years that the Count is ready to pay the enormous arrears of interest he owes, for the use of the gem for four-and-twenty hours. But the credit of the kingdom will not extend to the payment of the money for which it was originally pledged, so that after it has figured in the ceremony it is to be restored to the custody of the lender's representatives. The Count has every interest in the success of his mission, for its failure is to cost him his head. Yet, with the confidence of a high-bred gentleman, he accepts Grode's assurances that the gem will be forthcoming by the day he must start for Caspia; and in the meantime he makes his mind tolerably easy, and kills the time with the ordinary distractions of society. We have told enough to indicate the course of the story. Levi, like the man in the parable, has spent his all to become the possessor of the gem of great price; but, unlike his Scriptural prototype, his purchase proves his misery. He is reduced to the verge of starvation; he sees his mother dying slowly of want—he was really fondly attached to her—and finally he is deprived of his treasure by Grode, who takes advantage of his private information and Levi's extreme necessity. Grode gains nothing by the cruel bargain he imposes on his enemy. The stone sold at the sale was a false one. The real emerald was set in an old-fashioned brooch given to his daughter, "the Pearl," by her lover, Arthur Cranstoun, a brooch he had seen her wear under his eye at the very time he was chasing the sham that has proved the will-o'-the-wisp to him and to Levi.

We need hardly say the author heaps absurdity on absurdity, for the audacity with which he sets all possibility at defiance is his very merit, and no trifling one either. In many instances his absurdities are introduced with admirable cleverness; nor do we find the slightest fault with him when he talks of a stone worth six millions; when he makes Levi throw away his fortune in a desperate speculation; or when the Czar's European envoy assumes as a matter of course that in the event of his failure he must go quietly back to Asia to meet an inevitable doom. All these impossibilities are legitimate, and they preserve throughout the colouring that is appropriate to the story. But we submit that, the more the author ventures in this way, the more he is bound to be carefully accurate in what would be the hinges of an ordinary plot. Swift invented the Lilliputians, but he was scrupulously attentive to preserve the relation of proportions in the realm of Lilliputia. Thus, when the shrewd Levi had got the priceless emerald he loved better than his soul, he was scarcely likely to leave the shutters of his hovel open, so that his enemy Grode might see his acquisition and his raptures over it. Nor is Mr. Francillon wise in saying in an offhand manner that it does not concern us to know how it came about that a young clerk like Grode should learn the momentous secret of a great millionaire like Cranstoun. This seems to us precisely a point on which Mr. Francillon for his own sake should have been as minute and satisfactory as possible, if he desired to raise a mirage and cast a glamour over our eyes. Nevertheless we are bound to recognize the great merit of some of Mr. Francillon's psychological studies. The contrasts may be characteristically violent, and the displays of feeling and passion exaggerated, if not distorted. Yet the Jew Levi is very excellently worked out, when his love for the stone which has become all the world to him has turned to the very insanity of adoration; when his nightly rapture over its charms, and all the power and pleasures it represents, consoles him for days of abject misery and gnawing famine, and sustains him even against the remorse he feels at the idea of his mother being slowly sacrificed to his idol, although his nature nearly falls to pieces in the struggle. Then we have some good love scenes; and a pretty picture of romantic devotion in Felicia Grode, "the Pearl," who becomes the wife and ministering angel of the ruined Cranstoun. We do not like that touch of Dickens in the epilogue, when the stone that had shone like green glass in the old brooch throws of a sudden a flood of emerald light on the *dénouement*. But the faults of the book are those of the design, while all its merits are the author's; and though readers may differ as to how far they like it, we can tell them that at all events it will repay perusal.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

FEW topics of the day possess more vital interest than that of the reorganization of the French army, and the part which that force may be expected to play, whether in relation to neighbouring countries or to political parties in its own. Captain Max Jahns⁴ offers a contribution to the question in the shape of a history of the official organization and individual temper of the French army from the Revolution to the present day. Historically, the work is little else than an indictment against the spirit of the force, supported by countless well authenticated instances of its insubordination. The judgment of a German staff officer cannot be slighted; nevertheless it appears to us that Captain Jahns decidedly underrates both the efficiency of the French troops during the period of which he treats, and the probability of their again becoming formidable after their late disasters. He writes, we

are inclined to think, too much from the point of view of a German officer educated in the severest school, to whom anything like indiscipline is intolerable. In the abstract he is undoubtedly right, but perhaps he may not sufficiently consider that the very recklessness and levity of temperament which render such aberrations familiar to Frenchmen help them over their evil effects; that a certain amount of license is inseparable from the idea of a popular army, and that the army has always been popular in France in the sense of maintaining a lively sympathy with the body of the people. Whether this sentiment can survive in the midst of civil distractions is indeed a serious question, but one which it would be premature to determine until the issue of those dissensions is more apparent than it is at present. France will at any time acquiesce in any Government which can persuade her that she is looked up to by the world, and the mere fact of the present uniqueness of her Republican institutions among the constitutions of the principal European States will, should the Republic ever be consolidated, go far to enlist national pride in its favour, and establish discipline on its firmest basis—that of willing submission to restraint. Captain Jahns, on the other hand, thinks that the French army is going the way of the Spanish, and will in process of time become a degenerate Praetorian Guard, formidable only to the nation. This could hardly be the case if the system of universal compulsory service were fairly carried out; but this again he considers a system alien to the national genius. In thus deciding he seems to overlook the omnipotence of a strong centralized administration in France, and the probability of the Government being at no distant date in the hands of men pledged by their interests as well as their professions to rely upon the great mass of the people, and to make compulsory service a reality. In a word, the book is that of an able military critic, applying himself to questions whose solution demands a large share of political intelligence besides.

The first volume of Herr A. L. Ewald's history of the Conquest and Conversion of Prussia⁵ includes the long and sanguinary struggles, attended with great vicissitudes of fortune, which preceded the organization of the Teutonic Knights, down to the assignment of the country to that Order by Pope Gregory IX., and the death of the Grand-Master Hermann von Salza, in 1239. By this time the obstinate contest was virtually decided. Herr Ewald's work evinces a thorough study of his materials, and is as clear and interesting as the confusion and obscurity attaching to his subject allow.

Dr. Julius Krebs⁶ has explored an interesting department of the politics of the Thirty Years' War, which he finds to have been imperfectly investigated by Gindely. From the Bernburg archives he has extracted a large amount of material concerning the negotiations of Prince Christian von Anhalt, the confidential adviser of the Elector Palatine, previously to the acceptance of the Bohemian Crown by the latter. The unfortunate issue of these affairs is ascribed by him to the political shortcomings of the Prince, who is represented as a man of lively talents, but fickle, over-sanguine, and disposed to chimerical projects. One of the latter was an alliance with the Duke of Savoy, which occupied much of the attention of the Palatine Cabinet at the time, but ultimately came to nothing.⁷

Ernest Augustus, Duke of Saxe Weimar⁸, the grandfather of Goethe's patron and friend, played no very important part in the politics of his day, but showed in a rudimentary form some of the qualities which made the fame of his descendant. To the taste not uncommon among princes for building and military display he united a turn for science, which seduced him into a quest after the philosopher's stone. On the whole, though politically insignificant, and as an administrator about midway between the few, good and the many bad among his princely contemporaries, he was sufficiently interesting to justify the selection of his biography by Baron von Beaulieu-Marconnay as a contribution to the history of German culture in the eighteenth century.

Professor Nitzsch's work on the Roman Annalists⁹ consists principally of a detailed inquiry into the sources of information of which Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus availed themselves. The result arrived at is that these historians were largely dependent on the works of Valerius Antias and Licinius Macer, composed about the time of Sulla in the interests of political faction, and from diametrically opposite points of view. By the time of Augustus this party tendency had dropped out of sight, and the unsuspecting use of their irreconcilable narratives, without due allowance for the motives which prompted their composition, is, Dr. Nitzsch considers, the principal cause of error and confusion in the accredited versions of Roman history.

Dr. Gustav Fritsch's comprehensive work on the Aboriginal Races of South Africa¹⁰ is a most important contribution to anthropo-

* *Das französische Heer von der grossen Revolution bis zur Gegenwart. Eine kultur-historische Studie.* Von Max Jahns. Leipzig: Grunow. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Christian von Anhalt und die kurpfälzische Politik am Beginn des dreissigjährigen Krieges.* Von Dr. Julius Krebs. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Ernst August, Herzog von Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach (1688-1748). Kultur-geschichtlicher Versuch.* Von Carl Freiherrn von Beaulieu-Marconnay. Leipzig: Hirzel. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Die Römische Annalistik, von ihren ersten Anfängen bis auf Valerius Antias.* Von K. W. Nitzsch. Berlin: Bornträger. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrika's, ethnographisch und anatomisch beschrieben.* Von Gustav Fritsch. Nebst einem Atlas. Breslau: Hirt. London: Williams & Norgate.

pological science. The author, having in the first instance qualified himself for the description of these people by a long residence among them, has since his return to Europe made himself master of the rich literature previously extant upon the subject, and now presents himself in the character of a critic of the labours of his predecessors, as well as a contributor of fresh material. Many of the observations of former travellers are, according to him, highly inaccurate. One fertile source of error has been the constant tendency to embellish savage life by the unconscious importation of European conceptions into a sphere to which they are wholly inapplicable. Thus, for example, the belief in a Supreme Being, discovered by many travellers among the Hottentots, resolves itself on inquiry into the veneration of a deified ancestor, and the greater part of what has passed for religion among the Kafirs is simply magic. Traces of religion, however, occur everywhere, even among the Bushmen. While, generally speaking, the morality and intelligence of savages have, under the influences of philanthropy or idealism, been represented in much too favourable a light, the Bushman has hardly received justice. Nothing can be more surprising than to find art, the last refinement of humanity, existing among these homeless, lawless wanderers in a far more developed state than among the Kafirs with their settled abodes and tribal organization. The facsimiles of Bushman paintings here given leave, however, no doubt of the fact; their analogy to the primitive representations of the cave bear and mammoth must strike every one. Dr. Fritsch contests the theory of the Bushmen being merely degenerate Hottentots, though he appears to admit the possible affinity of the two races. They are alike in their incapacity, not precisely for civilization, but for the retention of their national integrity under its influences; they dwindle and disappear, while the Kafir race adapts itself readily to circumstances. The work is arranged in sections corresponding with the eight tribes of which it treats; every material particular relating to any of them is circumstantially stated; the illustrations, partly included in the book, partly accompanying it in the form of an atlas, are numerous, and well executed. The author is not unconscious of the bearing of his researches on the problem of the origin of man, but considers it as yet premature to express any opinion on this point.

Keate's narrative of Captain Wilson's shipwreck and residence upon the Pelew Islands* belongs to the classics of English travel, and the Captain's interesting *protégé*, "Prince" Lee Boo, was within our own recollection one of the heroes of the nursery. It is, therefore, gratifying to have the means of renewing acquaintance with an archipelago so endeared by romantic associations, even although the account we receive of its present condition is less satisfactory than could have been desired. Dr. Semper, the well-known traveller in the Philippines, who visited the group in 1861 on board of an English merchant vessel, and spent nearly a year upon it, found the islanders suffering from the chronic mischief of dissensions among themselves, and still more from the sinister interference of foreign adventurers. One of these, a Captain Cheyne, known as an author on Polynesia, but represented by Dr. Semper as an unscrupulous man of singular craft and audacity, appeared at the date of the traveller's visit in a fair way to establish his authority over a considerable portion of the group. He had concluded a treaty with the principal chief (the text of which is given, and which is certainly a great curiosity) securing to himself a monopoly of the trade. He went a little too far, however, and shortly after Dr. Semper's visit was murdered, or perhaps justly put to death, by the natives. Dr. Semper comments in very strong terms on the retribution which an English naval officer was, in his opinion, misled into exacting for his death. A somewhat similar affair had taken place just before the arrival of the traveller, and was denounced by him in a communication to the *Diario de Manila*, here reprinted. No great blame can be attributed to the English naval authorities who naturally make the protection of their countrymen their first object, and are in a manner compelled to rely upon the *ex parte* statements of the latter. Evidently, however, the residence of an authorised agent on each of these groups, charged with the protection of the aborigines, would have prevented not only these, but the far more lamentable and disgraceful transactions which we have had to deplore in connexion with Queensland. It is to be earnestly trusted that the matter will not be lost sight of. No remedy, it may be feared, will suffice to arrest the decay of the native population, which, though the Pelews have suffered less than most groups from actual intercourse with Europeans, has dwindled from 40,000 to 10,000 within the last century. The principal among its numerous causes is, in Dr. Semper's opinion, the abrupt introduction of firearms and other conveniences of an advanced civilization, which has destroyed the springs of energy and vitality by making life too easy to an indolent race. The pride and ingenuity of the Polynesian were previously called forth by the preparation of his weapons and implements; he now receives them at second-hand from the foreigner, and vegetates where he formerly lived. Dr. Semper's picture of the amiability and simplicity of the islanders is most attractive, and corresponds in all material respects to Captain Wilson's; the beauties of scenery and the picturesque traits of manners and customs are also vividly

painted; and, notwithstanding the painful character of many of the details, the book produces on the whole a very agreeable impression.

The leading idea of Dr. H. Maurus's work on "Freedom in Political Economy" * appears to be that employers and employed are at present too much interfered with in some respects and left too much at liberty in others. It is easier to abolish restrictions than to impose them, and we do not clearly comprehend how the writer proposes to deal with the second branch of the evil he indicates, or indeed how he demonstrates its existence. Some disquisitions on incidental topics are clear and cogent. Without precisely belonging to the Socialist school, Herr E. Richter's "Humanity and Capital" † is an indictment of the latter. The writer would wish to see a less partial distribution of wealth throughout the community, but is apparently better qualified to denounce the evils of excessive accumulation than to propound any practical plan for abating them.

With German exactness, and un-German symmetry and conciseness, Professor E. Schrader ‡ has condensed the results of investigation into cuneiform texts into a moderate-sized volume. In the first part he treats of the materials; in the second of the method of decipherment; in the third of the grammatical rules and vocabulary elicited by this process. The last section of the book gives the Babylonian text of the trilingual inscriptions of the Persian monarchs at Behistun and elsewhere, with a translation and glossary. In his introduction the author states that he has formerly put forth an essay on the subject tentatively, in the vain hope of extorting a statement of the grounds of their incredulity from those who professed scepticism as to the value of cuneiform researches. The present challenge cannot be overlooked, and we trust that its effect may be to induce German scholars to enter freely upon a field of inquiry where they are so highly qualified to excel.

Karl Strack's interesting and instructive history of public education in Germany § describes the principles which have swayed it from time to time, and their effects as manifested in the educational legislation and organization of the various States, from the Reformation to the present day. One acceptable feature of the work is the full account of the ideas of the theorists like Rousseau, and the systems of the practical instructors like Comenius, by whom the development of educational methods has been principally influenced.

Dr. Weske's || little book is intended to lay the foundation of a comparative grammar of the Ugric languages, on the plan of Bopp's great work. The writer has the advantage of being himself an Esthonian by birth, which, he states, enabled him to correct many errors committed by his predecessors.

On January 13, 1869, the inhabitants of Gross-Gerau were disagreeably reminded of the originally volcanic character of the Rhineland by a smart shock of earthquake, which phenomenon has since been frequently repeated. To considerations on the causes of earthquakes in general, and of this Rhenish one in particular, Herr F. Dieffenbach ¶ has subjoined a very useful chronological table of all the earthquakes and eruptions in any part of the globe which have been recorded from January 1869 to July 1872.

Professor Huber's essay on the Darwinian theory ** is chiefly valuable for a highly interesting analysis of the principal works which have appeared on the subject. As the general result of his examination we may gather that the conception of evolution is now accepted by most naturalists, that natural selection is usually admitted as a real element in the process, that hardly any one regards this factor alone as an adequate explanation of the phenomena, that evolution is consequently conceived as the development of some inner formative principle, or the embodiment of a pervading impersonal life. The substantial concurrence of so many independent inquirers is very remarkable, and affords proof of the concurring tendencies of modern scientific speculation. All the works here noticed, it is to be observed, were published before the appearance of Dr. Bastian's researches, which would have strongly corroborated the conclusions of the majority among them.

The second volume of L. Geiger's work on the origin of language ††, left imperfect by the deceased author, is principally devoted to retracing terms either employed in industry and art, or of ethical or metaphysical signification, back to the simple rudiments from which they originally sprang. In so far as the process can be depended upon, it is an invaluable aid to the reconstruction of the most primitive human epoch, but almost every derivation may be more or less the subject of controversy.

* *Über die Freiheit in der Volkswirtschaft*. Von Dr. H. Maurus. Heidelberg: Winter. London: Nutt.

† *Menschheit und Capital*. Von Emil Richter. Bd. 1. Leipzig: Luckhardt. London: Trübner.

‡ *Die assyrisch-babylonischen Keilschriften. Kritische Untersuchung der Grundlagen ihrer Entzifferung*. Von Prof. E. Schrader. Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Asher & Co.

§ *Geschichte des deutschen Volksschulwesens*. Von Karl Strack. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann. London: Asher & Co.

|| *Untersuchungen zur vergleichenden Grammatik des Fionischen Sprachstamms*. Von Dr. M. Weske. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. London: Williams & Norgate.

¶ *Plutonismus und Vulkanismus in der Periode von 1868-1872*. Von F. Dieffenbach. Darmstadt: Jonghaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

** *Die Lehre Darwin's, kritisch betrachtet*. Von Dr. Johannes Huber. München: Stahl. London: Nutt.

†† *Ursprung und Entwicklung der menschlichen Sprache und Vernunft*. Bd. 2. Von L. Geiger. Stuttgart: Cotta. London: Williams & Norgate.

* *Die Palau-Inseln im Stille Ocean. Reiseerlebnisse*. Von Karl Semper. Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

In proportion to the cordiality of our concurrence with Dr. Gistel* as to the interest attaching to the biography of Linnaeus is our regret that the task should have fallen into such absolutely incompetent hands. It might not be fair to describe Dr. Gistel's zeal for the subjects of his work as a zeal not according to knowledge, inasmuch as his knowledge is obviously extensive and accurate; but it is certainly a zeal not in accordance with discretion and good sense. Linnaeus's greatness was such that even his biographer's appreciation of it can perhaps hardly be pronounced excessive; what is really exceptional, almost ludicrous, is his total incapacity to "deliver himself of it like a man of this world." The book is, from beginning to end, a series of funny little explosions of admiration, resembling the ineffectual spirits of a squib that declines to go off. Being conscientiously compiled from authorities, it does no doubt abound with interesting particulars, which will be enjoyed in proportion to the reader's resolution and success in ignoring the grotesque commentary with which the author has seen fit to accompany them.

The life of Franz Schubert † was not eventful, and although Herr August Reissmann, already honourably known as the biographer of Schumann, has bestowed due diligence on the external details, he is evidently more at home in musical criticism. The most generally interesting part of his criticism is the chapter on Schubert as the typical representative of the romantic school, the composer in whom, as the author considers (perhaps overlooking the influential genius of Weber), its peculiar tendencies first found adequate musical expression. The influence of Schubert on his successors Mendelssohn and Schumann is also analysed; the recent revival of interest in his compositions, begun by Schumann and carried to its height by English musical critics, is not noticed so fully as it might have been. A catalogue of Schubert's works is added, as also an appendix of some unpublished juvenile compositions and a facsimile.

A translation of Mr. Forster's *Life of Dickens*‡, by Dr. F. Althaus, deserves especial notice for its remarkable excellence. It is at once very literal and very spirited.

* *Carolus Linnaeus. Ein Lebensbild.* Von J. F. X. Gistel. Frankfurt: Sauerländer. London: Asher & Co.

† *Franz Schubert. Sein Leben und seine Werke.* Dargestellt von A. Reissmann. Berlin: Guttentag. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Charles Dickens' Leben.* Von John Forster. Ins Deutsche übertragen von F. Althaus. Bd. I. Berlin: Decker. London: Trübner.

Professor BEESLY requests us to state that the article on the Game-laws in the current number of the Fortnightly Review, referred to in the SATURDAY REVIEW of last week, was written not by him, but by his brother, Mr. A. H. BEESLY.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW or POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF NO. 907, MARCH 15, 1873:

The Resignation of the Ministry.
The Chancellor's Defence of his Bill. The Irish University Bill and the Irish Vote. Spain. The South Wales Strike. Germany. The Southern States of America. France. The House of Lords and Deceased Wife's Sister.

Political Portraits.
Moving House. Extinct Journalism. The Ancient Monuments Bill. Italy for Nervous Patients. Marriage in the Fifteenth Century. Ultramontane Criticism. Habitual Drunkards. The Happy Land.

Wyllie Thomson's Depths of the Sea.

Animals and their Masters. Lamfrey's Napoleon I. Bright Morning. The Register of Archbishop Gray. Persia and "the Debatable Lands." Gregory Hawkshaw. Abbott's Lucian. Pearl and Emerald. German Literature.

CONTENTS OF NO. 906, MARCH 8, 1873:

The Position of the Government—President Grant's Message—The Irish University Debate—Progress of Disorder in Spain—M. Thiers and the Republic—Railway Property—Difficulties of European Government—Mr. Plimsoll's Motion—The Three Right Honourables.

Culpeper Luxury—Sleaford—Deputations to the Archbishop of Canterbury—The Forged Bills—Soldiers and their Pocket-Money—Heirs and Money-Lenders—Rabbits—Coins in the British Museum.

Dillinger on the Reunion of Christendom—Dasent's Jest and Earnest—Sagas from the Far East—Macleod's Economic Philosophy—Johannes Olaf—The French Indo-Chinese Expedition—The Fool of Quality—Sir George Pollock.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—PARTICULAR ATTRACTIONS. THIS DAY and NEXT WEEK.

Saturday (March 18)—Twentieth Saturday Concert, at 3.

Monday, Wednesday, and Friday—Exposition of "Spiritism," &c., at 4, by Messrs. Maskeyne and Cook; and other attractions.

Tuesday—Opera, "Lucia di Lammermoor," at 3.

Wednesday—First Dress Rehearsal Concert, at 2; Special Exhibition of Spring Flowers.

The Fine Arts Collection and Collections, including the Picture Gallery (the Works, the Technological and Natural History Collections), all the various illustrations of Art, Science, and Nature, and the Gardens and Park always open.

Admission, Monday to Friday, 1s.; Saturday, 2s. 6d.; Guinea Session Ticket, Free.

CRYSTAL PALACE OPERA.—A SERIES OF SIX PERFORMANCES will be given in the new Theatre before the Easter Holidays, preliminary to the commencement of the regular Season in May. They will take place on the Tuesdays and Thursdays, March 18, 20, 22, 24, April 1 and 3, on which occasions the following Operas will be performed:—"The Corsair," by Charles Dibell, the Libretto founded on Lord Byron's Poem. The undermentioned Artists have been engaged:—Miss Blanche Cole, Miss Fanny Heywood, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. George Purcell, Mr. Nordholm, Mr. Fredrik (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

CRYSTAL PALACE OPERA.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have been formed, and at the same time the acoustic properties and the ventilation of the house have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists will appear:—Miss Edith, Wynne, Miss Annie Gould, Miss Thérèse M. M. M. (her first appearance at the Crystal Palace), Mr. Celli (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace), and Mr. Mass (his first appearance at the Crystal Palace). Chorus from Her Majesty's Theatre. Full Orchestra. Conductor, Mr. MANNES. The incidental Ballets by Madame Collier. The new Scenery by Mr. F. Fenlon and Assistant, Mr. T. H. Franklin. Company, Stage Manager. Subscription now open: General Seats, 2s. 6d.; Half-Gallery, 1s.; Stalls, 6s.; Boxes, 12s.; Gallery, 1s.; Box Seats, One Shilling; and all exclusive of Admission to the Palace.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—REBUILDING of the OPERA THEATRE.—During the recess the Theatre has been reconstructed and greatly improved. The floor has been altered so as to rise gradually from the stage to the back of the house, by means of which an uninterrupted view of the performance will be afforded to every one present. Comfortable side galleries (an excellent view of the stage) have been constructed, and the end galleries have been enlarged and improved, so that the space which makes it an excellent position both for seeing and hearing. Fresh entrances and exits have received careful consideration.

MORNING BALLAD CONCERT.—Mr. JOHN BOOSEY

begs to announce a MORNING CONCERT, at St. James's Hall, on Monday,

March 21, at Two o'clock, when the following Artists

